Yes, we have worked toward eradication of the poverty that takes so high a toll on those afflicted by it and of those who must carry its burden.

Yes, we have transformed a cold and heartless immigration policy into one that is just, humane and progressive.

Yes, we have seen to the adequate hospital and medical care of our fathers and mothers; we have resolved to defeat illness and disease which bring loss to our economy, which bring pain to our families. In the past three years we have more than doubled our federal investments in health.

Yes, we have helped create an economy of growth and justice—an economy of more jobs, higher salaries and wages, greater investment and profit . . . an economy able to sustain our responsibilities both to our own people and to peace and security in the world.

We have had five years of action, of growth, of change, of social progress.

We began. We continued. And we have done well.

But we are a people, we are a party never satisfied . . . restless in our search for the fulfillment of America's promise.

Now we must march on. We have the means—these is no doubt about it. Ours is the richest and most powerful society ever created on earth. There is only the question of our will . . . of our determination to wage our peaceful revolution for the many, even though the few may be satisfied today.

Life in our cities can be more than steaming asphalt and crowded tenements . . . more than filthy air and polluted water . . . more than clogged highways and congested streets . . . more than bursting schoolrooms and underpaid teachers . . . more than violence and hopelessness and discrimination and hate and despair . . . more than temporary material satisfaction.

The way lies open to build a society in which the human values, above all, count uppermost.

The way lies open to cities filled with green and open space . . . to transportation that is safe, comfortable, rapid . . . to neighborhoods once more filled with neighbors . . . to schools and universities that truly care about the future of our children . . . to rural areas, towns, cities, suburbs where people—because they are citizens, because they are people—can live together in harmony and cooperation, no matter what their age, the color of their skin, their religion, or their last name.

Some 21 years ago a great American President . . . a former Governor of New York . . . a man who was true to his party, his conscience and his country, sat at his desk in Warm Springs, Georgia to write an address he was never to deliver. That address was to have been given at a Jefferson Day dinner in 1945.

Franklin Roosevelt wrote then, on the unfinished page, the words that serve as our challenge today.

"The only limit to our realization of tomorrow," Franklin Roosevelt wrote, "will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith."

Let us then—as Democrats, as men and women who believe in liberalism and social progress—move forward, with strong and active faith, to the victory that can be ours.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. DANIEL K. INOUYE, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

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

Eternal God, Father of all men, Thou hast taught us that in quietness and in confidence shall be our strength. In the midst of these feverish days we pray that Thou wilt breathe through the heats of our desire Thy coolness and Thy balm.

Take from our souls the strain and stress and let our ordered lives confess the beauty of Thy peace.

Strengthen us with Thy might that the anxious pressures of these days may not break our spirits and that no denials of human freedom now loose in the world may intimidate our souls.

We thank Thee for the stirrings of discontent within us with things as they are—for visions of a glory still to transfigure the earth, for the hope of brotherhood and justice and abiding peace.

Make real to us the kingdom within whose radiant realities are its faith, its ideals, its visions of beauty, and its aspirations that lay hold of God and goodness.

We ask it in the name of the One who is the fairest among 10,000 and the One altogether lovely. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., October 11, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. DANIEL K. INOUYE, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. INOUYE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, October 10, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On October 8, 1966:

S. 196. An act for the relief of Georges Fraise;

S. 373. An act for the relief of Dr. M. Ubieta;

S. 2295. An act for the relief of Guiseppe Rubino; and

S. 2393. An act to provide for additional positions in certain departments and agencies, and for other purposes.

On October 10, 1966:

S. 1356. An act to amend the Judicial Code to permit Indian tribes to maintain civil actions in Federal district courts without regard to the $10,000 limitation, and for other purposes;

S. 1468. An act for the relief of Dorothy Eyre;

S. 2070. An act to provide for holding terms of the U.S. District Court for the District of South Dakota at Rapid City;

S. 2091. An act for the relief of Joaquin U. Villegomez;

S. 2540. An act to authorize the conclusion of an agreement for the joint construction by the United States and Mexico of an international flood control project for the Tijuana River in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of February 3, 1944, with Mexico, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 197. Joint resolution to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding thirty years, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED—WITHDRAWAL OF NOMINATION

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of David K. Burkhart, to be postmaster at Del Mar, Calif.; which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

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. 3488) to grant the consent of Congress for the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia to amend the Washington metropolitan area transit regulation compact to establish an organization empowered to provide transit facilities in the National Capital region, and for other purposes, and to enact said amendment for the District of Columbia, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 3423. An act to provide for the establishment of the Wolf Trap Farm Park in Fairfax County, Va., and for other purposes;

H.R. 8664. An act to implement the Agreement on the Importation of Educational,

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Scientific, and Cultural Materials, opened for signature at Lake Success on November 22, 1950, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 17788. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 17636. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1706).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Commerce:

Ross D. Davis, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

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

Francis J. Galbraith, of South Dakota, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Singapore;

Foy D. Kohler, of Ohio, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career ambassador, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of State;

Eugene Victor Rostow, of Connecticut, to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs;

Herbert Salzman, of New York, to be Assistant Administrator for Development Finance and Private Enterprise, Agency for International Development;

William R. Rivkin, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Senegal, and to serve concurrently as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to The Gambia;

Sol M. Linowitz, of New York, to be the Representative of the United States of America on the Council of the Organization of American States, with the rank of Ambassador;

Ellsworth Bunker, of Vermont, to be Ambassador at Large;

Llewellyn E. Thompson, of Colorado, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career ambassador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Maj. Gen. John J. Davis, U.S. Army, of Kansas, to be an assistant director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably sundry nominations in the diplomatic and Foreign Service. Since these names have previously appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they may be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

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

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

Maurice L. Hawes, of the District of Columbia, and sundry other persons, for appointment and promotion in the diplomatic and Foreign Service.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CLARK, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. MONDALE):

S. 3896. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation for the Social Sciences in order to promote research and scholarship in such sciences; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARRIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 3897. A bill for the relief of Dr. Christos A. Antoniou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO MAKE A CHANGE IN THE ENROLLMENT OF S. 1310

Mr. PELL submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 112) authorizing the Secretary of the Senate to make a change in the enrollment of S. 1310, which was considered and agreed to.

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

RESOLUTIONS

EXPENDITURES BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. MONRONEY (for himself, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. CASE, and Mr. BOGGS) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 311) authorizing expenditures by the Special Committee on the Organization of the Congress, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

PRINTING OF REPORT ENTITLED "PROFILE OF YOUTH—1966" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. PELL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 312) which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 312

Resolved, That a committee print in two parts entitled "Profile of Youth—1966", a report prepared at the request of Senator CLAIBORNE PELL for the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, be printed as a Senate document, and that there be printed eight hundred additional copies of such document for the use of that committee.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT OF STUDY ENTITLED "ASPECTS OF INTELLECTUAL FERMENT IN THE SOVIET UNION"

Mr. DODD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 313) which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 313

Resolved, That the study entitled "Aspects of Intellectual Ferment in the Soviet Union", prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, shall be printed as a Senate document.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed fifteen thousand additional copies of such Senate document, of which eight thousand copies shall be for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and seven thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CANNON, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

EXPENDITURES BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am submitting a resolution today on behalf of myself and Senators SPARKMAN, METCALF, MUNDT, CASE, and BOGGS, members of the Special Committee on the Organization of the Congress. The resolution authorizes the committee to receive, consider, and report an omnibus reorganization bill based on the recommendations of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress no later than March 31, 1967.

The resolution also provides for funds in a maximum amount of $15,000 for the month of January 1967.

This resolution is necessary because it has not been possible to schedule the legislative reorganization bill of 1966

(S. 3848), for floor action before adjournment. This bill had been reported by the special committee pursuant to Senate Resolution 293, giving the committee legislative authority for purpose of the omnibus reorganization bill. We had hoped that the bill could be acted on during this session so that the work of the special committee would have been completed. However, the busy schedule and the desire voiced by a number of Senators for careful consideration of this important legislation has forced a postponement until next January.

This resolution reinforces Senate Resolution 293, to make clear the bill may be reintroduced and reported by the special committee at the beginning of the 90th Congress. Since the life of the joint committee expires on December 31, 1966, the resolution provides for necessary funds for the month of January 1967. Next January the special committee will request such additional funds as may be required to complete our work early next year. These requests are made in accordance with the instructions of the Rules and Administration Committee when that committee considered the resolution creating the special committee.

The majority leader has already stated that consideration of the reorganization bill will be one of the first orders of business next January. The special committee looks forward to presenting this legislation for the consideration of every Member of this body at that time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 311) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Adminstration, as follows:

S. RES. 311

Resolved, That the Special Committee on the Organization of the Congress, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by S. Res. 293, Eighty-ninth Congress, agreed to August 26, 1966, is authorized to sit and act during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-ninth Congress and during the Ninetieth Congress until such committee shall cease to exist on March 31, 1967, for the purpose of receiving and considering a bill, when introduced and germane amendments relating thereto, having for its purpose the carrying out of the recommendations contained in the report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, Report No. 1414, July 28, 1966. Such bill, when introduced, and amendments shall be referred to the committee for its consideration and such committee is hereby authorized to report to the Senate with respect to any such matter referred to it, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable. Nothing in this resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to report any bill or amendment containing any provision which has the effect of changing the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, or precedents of either House, or which has the effect of changing in any manner the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House, unless such provision is to carry out a recommendation contained in such report of July 28, 1966. Any vacancy occuring in the membership of the committee shall be filled by appointment by the President of the Senate.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, through January 31, 1967, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution which shall not exceed $15,000, through January 31, 1967, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, of New York, be added as a cosponsor to S. 3773, the youth camp safety bill.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the senior Senator from California, the distinguished minority leader, Mr. KUCHEL, be added as a cosponsor to S. 3723, a bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act relating to children under foster care.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] be added, at the next printing, as cosponsors of S. 3888, a bill to establish an Executive Organization Review Commission to investigate the organization of the executive branch of the Federal Government every 10 years.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 2877, the older Americans community service program, the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] be added as cosponsors.

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

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 11, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 3423) to provide for the establishment of the Wolf Trap Farm Park in Fairfax County, Va., and for other purposes.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanmious consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 1671, 1672, and 1673, in sequence.

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

LONG-TERM LEASES ON THE SAN XAVIER AND SALT RIVER PIMA-MARICOPA INDIAN RESERVATIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 7648) to authorize long-term leases on the San Xavier and Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservations, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 5, after line 9, to strike out:

SEC. 9. Any municipality an exterior boundary of which adjoins an exterior boundary of the San Xavier or the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Reservation may, with the consent of the Papago Council or the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community Council, as the case may be, and the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, annex all or any adjacent portion of the San Xavier Reservation or the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Reservation and, if it does so, all or any part as may be authorized by the said council and Secretary of the laws, ordinances, codes, resolutions, rules, or other regulations of such municipality (including zoning laws and building codes) shall, except as provided in section 12, subsections (b) and (c), of this Act, be of the same force and effect within the area so annexed as they are within the remainder of the municipality. It is the expectation of the Congress that the councils will, and it is the intention of the Congress that the Secretary of the Interior shall, at the earliest possible time agree to the fullest possible and practicable application of such laws, ordinances, codes, resolutions, and other regulations to the end that the annexed portions of the reservation may become an integral part of the annexing municipality. Section 3, subsection (a), of this Act shall be inapplicable to any part of the San Xavier or the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Reservation which is fully and completely annexed to a municipality pursuant to this section.

On page 6, after line 11, to strike out:

SEC. 10. (a) The State of Arizona may exercise, permanently or for a limited period of time, as authorized by the Secretary of the Interior and the Papago Council or the Salt River Pima Maricopa Community Council, as the case may be, full or partial jurisdiction, as agreed upon between said State, council, and Secretary, over offenses committed on, and causes of action arising on or concerning persons within, the whole or such portion or portions of the San Xavier and Salt River Pima Maricopa Reservations as are likewise agreed upon to the same extent as said State exercises jurisdiction over like offenses and causes of action elsewhere in said State, and there shall be applicable to offenses and causes of action with respect to which jurisdiction is so exercised by the State of Arizona within or affecting residents of said reservations the same laws of general applicability which are in force elsewhere in said State: *Provided*, That any tribal ordinance heretofore or hereafter adopted by the Papago Tribe or the Salt River Pima Maricopa Community in the exercise of any authority which it may possess and any tribal custom prevalent among residents of the reservations aforesaid shall, if not inconsistent with the applicable civil law of the State or any law of the United States, be given full force and effect in the determination of causes of action pursuant to this section.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of the enabling Act for the admission of the

State of Arizona to the Union (Act of June 20, 1910, 36 State, 557, 568), the consent of the United States is hereby given to the people of the State of Arizona to amend, if necessary, their State constitution or existing statutes, as the case may be, to remove any legal impediment to the assumption of civil and criminal jurisdiction over the San Xavier and Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Reservations in accordance with this Act.

On page 7, at the beginning of line 20, to change the section number from "11" to "9"; on page 8, at the beginning of line 4, to change the section number from "12" to "10"; after line 4, to strike out:

(a) limit the authority of the Papago Tribe or the Salt River Pima Maricopa Community, or the individual members thereof, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to provide in lease agreements for the extension of some or all of the State and county zoning ordinances, housing codes and health and sanitation laws to areas leased pursuant to this Act;

At the beginning of line 12, to strike out "(b)" and insert "(a)"; on page 9, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)"; at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)"; at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)"; and, at the beginning of line 13, to change the section number from "13" to "11".

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1703), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The primary purpose of H.R. 7648, as amended, is to provide long-term leasing authority for tribal and individual lands of the San Xavier and Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservations in Arizona for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, farming, or grazing purposes.

NEED

The San Xavier and Salt River Pima-Maricopa Reservations are adjacent to the cities of Tucson and Phoenix, respectively, two of the most rapidly expanding cities in the Southwest. In both instances the close proximity of city and reservation has created opportunities for profitable use of the Indian land if it can be leased for sufficiently long terms.

The maximum permissible term for which Indian land may be leased under existing general law is 25 years with a right of renewal for another 25 years. The Palm Springs, Navajo, Dania, Southern Ute, Colorado River, Fort Mojave, and Pyramid Lake Reservations have been granted longer lease terms because the 25-year authority is not sufficiently long to permit development loans in some instances and a clear 50-year minimum period plus an allowance of time for negotiations and construction is frequently required. In all of the instances just cited, legislative authority to lease for up to 99 years has been granted. H.R. 7648 does the same for the two reservations to which it applies, with, however, a limit of 40 years in the case of farming leases that require a substantial investment in the improvement of the land and 10 years in the case of grazing and other farming leases. The Secretary of the Interior will approve 99-year leases only if such extended period is absolutely essential.

SECTION-BY SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 deals with the leasing of Indian trust and restricted lands both tribal and individual, on the San Xavier and Salt River Pima-Maricopa Reservations for all purposes except mining. The maximum term of any lease under this act will be 99 years. Grazing leases and leases for farming which require no substantial investment in improvement of the land will not exceed 10 years. Leases for farming which require a substantial investment in improvement of the land may run as much as 40 years. The Secretary of the Interior is enjoined not to approve any lease "with a term that is longer than is necessary * * * to obtain maximum economic benefits for the Indian owners."

Section 2 requires that every lease entered into under the first section contain covenants against waste, nuisance, and the creation of hazards. It also provides for suits by the State of Arizona and its political subdivisions against lessees to prevent or abate violations of such covenants. Such a suit must first be brought in the U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona; if, however, that court finds that it lacks jurisdiction because the constitutional requirement that there be diversity of citizenship or that the case arise under the laws of the United States is not met, it may be brought in a court of the State.

Section 3, subsection (a), requires that the Secretary of the Interior advise municipalities adjacent to the San Xavier or Pima-Maricopa Reservations of the pendency of a lease for other than farming or grazing purposes 30 days before he approves it if, in his judgment, the lease will substantially affect their governmental interests. He is further required to consider any comments on the lease, insofar as its terms or absence of terms affect matters of municipal interest, that they may offer. These requirements are applicable only to leases under H.R. 7648, not to leases under other laws. The intent of Congress that the terms on which non-Indian development of land on these two reservations is undertaken shall, to the extent to which this is reasonably possible, be similar to those which State and local law imposes on the same sort of development in adjacent municipalities is stated in subsection (b).

Section 4, by reference to the act of September 8, 1940 (54 Stat. 745, 25 U.S.C. 380), authorizes the superintendents of the two reservations to lease the lands of deceased Indians, except for oil and gas, if the heirs and devisees have not been determined or if, the heirs and devisees having been determined, the lands are not in use by them and they cannot agree within 3 months on the terms of a lease. The decision of the superintendent in any such case will, under the provisions of this section, be subject to appeal to the Secretary.

Section 5 prohibits the payment and collection of rent more than 1 year of advance unless otherwise provided in the lease.

Section 6 provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall approve no lease containing a provision "that will prevent or delay a termination of Federal trust responsibilities" during the lease term.

Section 7 authorizes the Indian owners of land on the San Xavier and Salt River Pima-Maricopa Reservations to dedicate land for various public purposes with the approval of the Secretary. The conditions under which this may be done will be similar to those under which dedications may be made elsewhere under the laws of Arizona. Consideration was given in committee to expand this section to cover the granting of rights-of-way for utilities, but this was found to be unnecessary in view of section 1 of the act of February 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 17, 25 U.S.C. 323).

Section 8 authorizes the Papago Tribal Council and the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Community Council to contract with the State and its political subdivisions for water, sewerage, police, and other public services. In doing so, the council concerned must have the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

Section 9 of the bill as reported authorizes the Papago and Pima-Maricopa councils, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior and in the absence of State jurisdiction over the lands in question, to adopt building, zoning, and sanitary regulations. The councils are also authorized to contract with local authorities for assistance in preparing such regulations.

Section 10 makes clear that the preceding sections of the bill do not (a) authorize the alienation, encumbrance, or taxation of trust or restricted lands; (b) extend State jurisdiction to determine the ownership of trust or restricted property; (c) modify the existing authority of public school districts to include the reservations within their boundares; or (d) make inapplicable to the San Xavier and Salt River Pima-Maricopa Reservations other laws under which Indian lands may be leased and mortgaged.

Section 11 forbids the Secretary of the Interior to approve developments under other provisions of the bill which would affect adversely the scenic, historic, and religious values of the Mission Xavier del Bac on the San Xavier Reservation.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee has amended the bill by deleting sections 9, 10, and 12(a) as passed by the House.

Those sections related to the annexation of all or parts of the two reservations by adjacent municipalities, and the permanent or temporary extension of State jurisdiction over offenses committed on the reservations or causes of action arising on them where such was agreed to by the respective tribal council and the Secretary of the Interior.

For the reasons cited in the communication relating to H.R. 7648 from the Department of Justice, the committee believes the State of Arizona should take affirmative action under the authority of section 7 of the act of August 15, 1953 (67 Stat. 590), relating to the assumption by the States of jurisdiction over criminal offenses and civil causes of action in Indian country.

Further, it is the committee's recommendation that the Secretary of the Interior not approve leases on these reservations for terms beyond those presently authorized by law until the State of Arizona acts to assume jurisdiction under the authority of the 1953 act.

POPULAR ELECTION OF THE GOVERNOR OF GUAM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 11775) to provide for the popular election of the Governor of Guam, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, line 9, after "November", to strike out "8, 1966" and insert "3, 1970"; in line 10, after the word "year", to strike out "1968" and insert "1974"; at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "two" and insert "four"; in line 13, after the word "of", to strike out "two" and insert "four"; at the beginning of line 15, to insert "No person who has been elected Governor for two full successive terms shall be again eligible to hold that office until one full term has intervened."; in line 19, after the word "the", where it

appears the first time, to strike out "fifth day" and insert "first Monday"; on page 4, line 2, after the word "island", to strike out "or any part thereof" and insert "insofar as it is under the jurisdiction of the government of Guam, to be"; after line 24, to strike out:

SEC. 7. The Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and Acting Governor of Guam shall be removable from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, high crimes and misdemeanors. Inpeachment shall be by resolution adopted at an open session of the legislature held not less than fifteen days after introduction of the resolution. The vote on any such resolution shall be by the yeas and nays and the affirmative votes of at least three-quarters of the full membership of the legislature shall be requisite for its adoption. Notice of impeachment, which shall include the articles of impeachment, shall be filed by the speaker of the legislature with the clerk of the District Court of Guam who shall forthwith cause a true copy thereof to be served upon the person impeached. The judge of the district court shall notify the chief judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit who shall assign three judges of said circuit to try the impeachment at such time and at such place in Guam as may be specified by said chief judge. Judgment by such court shall be final and not reviewable in any other court and in case of conviction shall extend no further than removal from office and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, profit, or trust under the government of Guam, but the party impeached, whether convicted or acquitted, shall be liable to prosecution and punishment according to law. No officer shall exercise his official duties from the time he has been impeached and notified thereof until he has been acquitted.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 7. Any Governor or Acting Governor of Guam may be removed from office by the people registered to vote in Guam if: (a) 75 per centum of the persons registered to vote shall vote in favor of recall at a referendum election, and (b) the removal of the Governor or Acting Governor is approved by the President of the United States. The referendum may be initiated by the Legislature of Guam, following a two-thirds vote of the members of the legislature in favor of a referendum, or by a petition to the legislature of 25 per centum of the people registered to vote in Guam.

On page 7, line 10, after the word "by", to strike out "impeachment" and insert "recall"; on page 8, after line 10, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 5. Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, section 9 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 387; 48 U.S.C. 1422(c)) is amended by adding immediately after the end of section 9 the following new section 9–A:

"SEC. 9–A. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall appoint a government comptroller who shall receive an annual salary at a rate established in accordance with the standards provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The government comptroller shall hold office for a term of ten years and until his successor is appointed and qualified unless sooner removed by the Secretary of the Interior for cause. The government comptroller shall not be eligible for reappointment.

"(b) The government comptroller shall audit and settle all accounts and claims pertaining to the revenues and receipts from whatever source of the government of Guam and of funds derived from bond issues; and he shall audit and settle, in accordance with law and administrative regulations, all expenditures of funds and property pertaining to the government of Guam including those pertaining to trust funds held by the government of Guam.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the government comptroller to bring to the attention of the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of Guam all failures to collect amounts due the government, and expenditures of funds or uses of property which are irregular, unnecessary or not pursuant to law. The audit activities of the government comptroller shall be directed so as to: (1) improve the efficiency and economy of programs of the government of Guam, and (2) discharge the responsibility incumbent upon the Congress to insure that the substantial Federal revenues which are covered into the treasury of the government of Guam are properly accounted for and audited.

"(d) It shall be the duty of the government comptroller to certify to the Secretary of the Interior the net amount of government revenues which form the basis for Federal grants for the civil government of Guam.

"(e) The decisions of the government comptroller shall be final except that appeal therefrom may, with the concurrence of the Governor, be taken by the party aggrieved or the head of the department concerned, within one year from the date of the decision, to the Secretary of the Interior, which appeal shall be in writing and shall specifically set forth the particular action of the government comptroller to which exception is taken, with the reasons and the authorities relied upon for reversing such decision.

"(f) If the Governor does not concur in the taking of an appeal to the Secretary, the party aggrieved may seek relief by suit in the District Court of Guam if the claim is otherwise within its jurisdiction. No later than thirty days following the date of the decision of the Secretary of the Interior, the party aggrieved or the Governor, on behalf of the head of the department concerned, may seek relief by suit in the District Court of Guam, if the claim is otherwise within its jurisdiction.

"(g) The government comptroller is authorized to communicate directly with any person having claims before him for settlement, or with any department officer or person having official relation with his office. He may summon witnesses and administer oaths.

"(h) As soon after the close of each fiscal year as the accounts of said fiscal year may be examined and adjusted, the government comptroller shall submit to the Governor of Guam, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives an annual report of the fiscal condition of the government, showing the receipts and disbursements of the various departments and agencies of the government.

"(i) The government comptroller shall make such other reports as may be required by the Governor of Guam, the Comptroller General of the United States, or the Secretary of the Interior.

"(j) The office of the government comptroller shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, but shall not be a part of any executive department in the government of Guam.

"(k) The office and activities of the government comptroller of Guam shall be subject to review by the Comptroller General of the United States, and reports thereon shall be made by him to the Governor, the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Congress.

"(l) The salary of the government comptroller and the expenses of his office shall be paid by the United States from funds to be covered into the treasury of Guam pursuant to section 30 of the Organic Act of Guam, but such salary and expenses shall not exceed such amounts as may be specified annually in Federal appropriation Acts.

"(m) All departments, agencies, and establishments shall furnish to the government comptroller such information regarding the powers, duties, activities, organization, financial transactions, and methods of business of their respective offices as he may from time to time require of them; and the government comptroller, or any of his assistants or employees, when duly authorized by him, shall, for the purpose of securing such information, have access to and the right to examine any books, documents, papers, or records of any such department, agency, or establishment."

On page 12, at the beginning of line 8, to change the section number from "5" to "6"; after line 13, to strike out:

SEC. 6. Section 26 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 391; 48 U.S.C. 1421d), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 7. (a) Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, subsection (c) of section 26 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 391; 48 U.S.C. 1421d(c)) is repealed.

(b) Effective January 4, 1971, section 26 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 391; 48 U.S.C. 1421d), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

On page 13, at the beginning of line 4, to change the section number from "7" to "8"; in line 11, after the word "unincorporated", to strike out "Territory" and insert "territory"; at the beginning of line 13, to change the section number from "8" to "9"; in line 18, after the word "unincorporated", to strike out "Territory" and insert "territory"; after line 18, to strike out:

SEC. 9. Except as to provisions applicable to the election of the Governor and Lieutenant Governor, which provisions shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act, and unless otherwise expressly provided herein, this Act shall be effective January 5, 1967.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 10. Those provisions necessary to authorize the holding of an election for Governor and Lieutenant Governor on November 3, 1970, shall be effective on January 1, 1970. All other provisions of this Act, unless otherwise expressly provided herein, shall be effective January 4, 1971.

And, on page 14, at the beginning of line 5, to change the section number from "10" to "11".

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1704), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The primary purpose of H.R. 11775, introduced by Representative O'BRIEN, following receipt of an executive communication from the Secretary of the Interior requesting that this be done, is to provide for the popular election of Governor and Lieutenant Governor for the territory of Guam. Other purposes which H.R. 11775 as passed by the House of Representatives and as amended by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, would accomplish are: (1) Create the office of Lieutenant Governor;

(2) provide that the salaries and expenses of the office of the executive and legislative branches be paid by the Government of Guam; (3) specify the powers, duties and responsibilities of the Governor; (4) provide a method of recall for removal of the Governor; (5) set out the line of succession in the event the Governor is disabled; (6) create the office of Government Comptroller and specify the powers, duties, responsibilities, and procedures of that office; (7) provide that the expenses and salaries of the office of the Government Comptroller shall be paid by the United States from funds to be covered into the treasury of Guam pursuant to section 30 of the Organic Act of Guam, thus resulting in a substantial savings to the Federal Government; (9) extend the privileges and immunities clauses, the due process clause, and the equal protection clause of the U.S. Constitution to the people of Guam; (10) make Guam subject to the general military law of the United States; and (11) make certain technical changes in the organic act.

BACKGROUND AND NEED

H.R. 11775, as amended, represents a significant forward step in the development of full local self-government in Guam and toward the fulfillment of the political aspirations of its people.

Following World War II and the transfer of administrative responsibility of the unincorporated territory of Guam from the Secretary of the Navy to the Secretary of the Interior the island has made remarkable economic, political, and social progress. The organic act of 1950 (64 Stat. 384, 48 U.S.C. ch. 8A) was the first important step toward the granting of local-self-government taken by the Congress. It gave American citizenship to the Guamanians, created a 21-member unicameral legislature, provided for appointment of the Governor by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, directed that locally collected Federal income taxes be covered into the territorial treasury, and turned over to the government of Guam title to much real property located there which the United States owned.

During the consideration of the organic act, members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs advised the Guamanians that additional measures of self-government would be extended to them commensurate with their proven capacities and indications of mature judgment. In line with this, the Congress has enacted several items of significant legislation since 1950, each encouraging local responsibility: Public Law 84–876 made it possible for the government of Guam to collect taxes on post exchange gasoline sales; Public Law 86–316 permits civil suits to be filed against the government of Guam; Public Law 88–183 gave the government of Guam concurrent jurisdiction with the United States over "parties found, acts performed, and offenses committed" on Federal property in Guam and transferred to the territorial government certain submerged areas bordering on the island; Public Law 88–170, in authorizing the appropriation of funds to assist Guam in recovering from heavy typhoon damage, provided for the concurrence of the legislature in requests for appropriations made by the Governor; Public Law 88–171 authorized the creation of an urban renewal authority on Guam; and Public Law 89–100 provides that the legislature may determine the salaries of its own members and that these shall be paid by the local rather than the Federal Government.

The present bill is thus the latest in a long series of measures designed to grant the Guamanian people an ever-increasing share in the government of their island. A number of factors make it clear that the time is ripe for this additional step. The people of Guam have now had 16 years experience in electing their own legislature and have demonstrated their capacity for doing so in a responsible manner. The strong two-party political system that exists in Guam is evidence of their political maturity. Except in such emergency cases as the one caused by Typhoon Karen in November 1962, a large portion of the expenses of the government of Guam are borne locally and the expenditure of Guam's tax revenues are fully under local control. Since 1950, moreover, the governorship has become an office of almost exclusively territorial importance. The Governor no longer performs exclusive Federal functions, as he used to, but he does play an important role in local government since he performs all the usual functions of a Governor of one of our States, including those of recommending legislation and vetoing bills which, in his judgment, are improperly or unwisely passed by the legislature. It is the view of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, therefore, that his office should become one whose incumbent is in all respects responsible to the electorate of Guam.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 of the amended bill amends section 6 of the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the popular election of the Governor and Lieutenant Governor jointly for a 4-year term. The first election is to be held on November 3, 1970. Section 1 also specifies the powers, duties, and responsibilities of the Governor and provides that no person who has been elected Governor for two full successive terms shall be again eligible to hold that office until one full term has intervened.

Section 2 deletes section 7 of the organic act and provides a method of recall for removal of the Governor. The referendum requires the approval of 75 percent of the persons registered to vote, plus the approval of the President of the United States. The approval of the President was felt necessary by the members of the committee in light of the Governor's responsibility for the execution of all applicable Federal laws in Guam and in light of the substantial responsibility and interest of the Federal Government in the affairs of the territory.

Section 3 amends section 8 of the organic act and sets out the line of succession in the event of a vacancy, temporary or permanent, in the office of Governor or Lieutenant Governor.

Section 4 deletes from section 9 of the organic act certain provisions which are, in part, duplicative of other portions of the bill and, in part, obsolete or inconsistent with full local self-government.

Section 5 creates the office of Government Comptroller and specifies the duties and responsibilities of the office. The salary and expenses of the office of the Government Comptroller will be paid by the United States from funds which are covered into the treasury of Guam pursuant to section 30 of the Organic Act of Guam. As a result, there will be no new or additional cost to the Federal Government.

Section 6 deletes certain provisions of section 19 of the organic act relating to gubernatorial and Presidential review of acts of the territorial legislature and substitutes for them a simple provision that if a measure is repassed over a gubernatorial veto by two-thirds of the full membership of the legislature, it shall be a law.

Section 7(a) repeals subsection (c) of section 26 of the Organic Act of Guam effective on the date of enactment of this act. This section had provided for payment, by the United States, of the transportation expenses of officers and employees of the government of Guam. Section 7(b) deletes the present provisions of section 26 of the organic act fixing and providing for payment by the United States of the salary of the Governor and Secretary of Guam and relating to other matters. It substitutes a provision authorizing these salaries to be fixed by act of the Guam Legislature and also provides that these, as well as all other executive and legislative department expenses shall be paid from local sources.

Section 8 in effect extends to Guam the provisions of article IV, section 2, clause 1 and of amendment XIV, section 1, of the U.S. Constitution. These are the privileges and immunities clauses of article IV and amendment XIV and the due process and equal protection clauses of the 14th amendment.

Section 9 extends to Guam the portions of the general military laws authorizing the President to use Federal and local forces in cases of insurrection and other like emergency.

Section 10 provides the effective dates for the various portions of the act.

Section 11 furnishes a short title for the act; namely, the "Guam Elective Governor Act."

POPULAR ELECTION OF THE GOVERNOR OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 11777) to provide for the popular election of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 3, to insert "That effective January 9, 1967, section 9, subsection (a) of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (68 Stat. 497, 501; 48 U.S.C. 1575(a)) is amended by deleting the first sentence and by substituting therefor the following: "The quorum of the legislature shall consist of eight of its members.',"; at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "That section" and insert "Sec 2. Section 9,"; on page 2, line 1, after the numerals "1575", to insert "(d)"; at the beginning of line 6, to change the section number from "2" to "3"; in line 23, after "November", to strike out "8, 1966" and insert "3, 1970"; in line 24 after the word "year", to strike out "1968" and insert "1974"; on page 3, line 1, after the word "every", to strike out "two" and insert "four"; in line 2, after the word "of", to strike out "two" and insert "four"; at the beginning of line 4, to insert "No person who has been elected Governor for two full successive terms shall be again eligible to hold that office until one full term has intervened."; in line 7, after the word "the", to strike out "fifth day" and insert "first Monday"; on page 4, line 22, after the word "islands", to strike out "or any parts thereof," and insert "insofar as they are under the jurisdiction of the government of the Virgin Islands, to be"; on page 5, after line 21, to strike out:

SEC. 12. The Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and Acting Governor of the Virgin Islands shall be removable from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, high crimes and misdemeanors. Impeachment shall be by resolution adopted at an open session of the legislature held not less than fifteen days after introduction of the resolution. The vote on any such resolution shall be by the yeas and nays and the affirmative votes of three-fourths of all the members of the legislature shall be requisite for its adoption. Notice of impeachment, which shall include the articles of impeachment, shall be filed by the duly elected presiding officer of the legislature with the clerk of the District Court of the Virgin Islands who shall forthwith cause a true copy thereof to be served

upon the person impeached. The judge of the district court shall notify the chief judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit who shall assign three judges of said circuit to try the impeachment at such time and at such place in the Virgin Islands as may be specified by said chief judge. Judgment by such court shall be final and not reviewable in any other court and, in case of conviction shall extend no further than removal from office and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, profit, or trust under the government of the Virgin Islands, but the party impeached, whether convicted or acquitted, shall be liable to prosecution and punishment according to law. No officer shall exercise his official duties from the time he has been impeached and notified thereof until he has been acquitted.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 12. Any Governor or Acting Governor of the Virgin Islands may be removed from office by the people registered to vote in the Virgin Islands if: (a) 75 per centum of the persons registered to vote shall vote in favor of recall at a referendum election, and (b) the removal of the Governor or Acting Governor is approved by the President of the United States. The referendum may be initiated by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands, following a two-thirds vote of the members of the legislature in favor of a referendum, or by a petition to the legislature of 25 per centum of the people registered to vote in the Virgin Islands.

On page 7, at the beginning of line 12, to change the section number from "4" to "5"; at the beginning of line 15, to change the section number from "5" to "6"; on page 8, line 11, after the word "by", to strike out "impeachment" and insert "recall"; on page 9, at the beginning of line 10, to change the section number from "6" to "7"; after line 13, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 8. (a) Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, section 17, subsection (c), of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (68 Stat. 497, 504; 48 U.S.C. 1599 (c)) is amended to read as follows: "(c) It shall be the duty of the government comptroller to bring to the attention of the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of the Virgin Islands, all failures to collect amounts due the government, and expenditures of funds or uses of property which are irregular, unnecessary or not pursuant to law. The audit activities of the government comptroller shall be directed so as to: (1) improve the efficiency and economy of programs of the government of the Virgin Islands and (2) discharge the responsibility incumbent upon the Congress to insure that the substantial federal revenues which are covered into the treasury of the government of the Virgin Islands are properly accounted for and audited."

(b) Effective on the date of enactment of this Act section 17, subsection (f), of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (68 Stat. 497, 505; 48 U.S.C. 1599(f)), as amended, is amended to read as follows: "(f) If the Governor does not concur in the taking of an appeal to the Secretary, the party aggrieved may seek relief by suit in the District Court of the Virgin Islands if the claim is otherwise within its jurisdiction. No later than thirty days following the date of the decision of the Secretary of the Interior, the party aggrieved or the Governor, on behalf of the head of the department concerned, may seek relief by suit in the District Court of the Virgin Islands if the claim is otherwise within its jurisdiction."

(c) Effective on the date of enactment of this Act section 17, subsection (h), of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (68 Stat. 497, 505; 48 U.S.C. 1599(h)) is amended to read as follows: "(h) As soon after the close of each fiscal year as the accounts of said fiscal year may be examined and adjusted, the government comptroller shall submit to the Governor of the Virgin Islands, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives an annual report of the fiscal condition of the government, showing the receipts and disbursements of the various departments and agencies of the government."

(d) Effective July 1, 1967, a new subsection (k) is added to section 17 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (68 Stat. 497, 505; 48 U.S.C. 1599) to read as follows: "(k) The salary of the government comptroller and the expenses of his office shall be paid by the United States from funds derived by transfer from the internal revenue collections appropriated for the Virgin Islands, but such salary and expenses shall not exceed such amounts as may be specified annually in Federal appropriation acts."

(e) Effective on the date of enactment of this Act a new subsection (l) is added to section 17 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (68 Stat. 497; 505; 48 U.S.C. 1599) to read as follows: "(l) All departments, agencies, and establishments shall furnish to the government comptroller such information regarding the powers, duties, activities, organization, financial transactions, and methods of business of their respective offices as he may from time to time require of them; and the government comptroller, or any of his assistants or employees, when duly authorized by him, shall, for the purpose of securing such information, have access to and the right to examine any books, documents, papers, or records of any such department, agency, or establishment."

On page 12, at the beginning of line 3, to change the section number from "7" to "9"; at the beginning of line 12, to change the section number from "8" to "10"; at the beginning of line 21, to change the section number from "9" to "11"; on page 13, line 1, after the word "the", to insert "unincorporated territory of the"; after line 1, to strike out:

SEC. 10. Except as to provisions applicable to the election of the Governor and Lieutenant Governor, which provisions shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act, and unless otherwise expressly provided herein, this Act shall be effective January 5, 1967.

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 12. Those provisions necessary to authorize the holding of an election for Governor and Lieutenant Governor on November 3, 1970, shall be effective on January 1, 1970. All other provisions of this Act, unless otherwise expressly provided herein, shall be effective January 4, 1971.

And, at the beginning of line 12, to change the section number from "11" to "13".

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1705), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The primary purpose of H.R. 11777, introduced by Representative O'Brien at the request of the Secretary of the Interior in an executive communication, is to provide for the election by popular vote of the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of the territory of the Virgin Islands. Other purposes which H.R. 11777, as amended, would accomplish are: (1) Create the office of Lieutenant Governor; (2) provide that the salaries and expenses of the executive and legislative branches be paid by the government of the Virgin Islands; (3) specify the powers, duties, and responsibilities of the Governor; (4) provide a method of recall for removal of the Governor; (5) set out the line of succession in the event the Governor is disabled; (6) clarify the powers, duties, responsibilities, and procedures of the office of the government comptroller; (7) provide that the expenses and salaries of the office of the government comptroller shall be paid by the United States from funds derived by transfer from the internal revenue collections appropriated for the Virgin Islands, thus resulting in a substantial savings to Federal Government; (8) extend the privileges and immunities clauses, the due process clause, and the equal protection clause of the U.S. Constitution to the people of the Virgin Islands; (9) make the Virgin Islands subject to the general military law of the United States; and (10) make certain technical changes in the revised organic act.

BACKGROUND AND NEED

H.R. 11777 is the latest of a number of steps that have been taken toward full local self-government in the Virgin Islands and toward fulfillment of the political aspirations of the people of the islands.

The Virgin Islands became U.S. territory in 1917 by purchase from Denmark. The original act to govern the new territory (act of March 3, 1917, 39 Stat. 1132) vested "all military, civil, and judicial powers" in a Governor appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Until 1931, when jurisdiction was transferred from the Department of the Navy to the Department of the Interior by Executive order and the first civilian Governor was appointed, it was the practice for a naval officer to be appointed to this position. The organic act of 1936 (act of June 22, 1936, 49 Stat. 1807) and the revised organic act of 1954 (act of July 22, 1954, 68 Stat. 497) continued this provision for Presidential appointment with the advice and consent of the Senate. It is to these and other related visions of present law that H.R. 11777 is addressed.

While the Virgin Islands have always thus far had an appointed Governor, they have also had a popularly elected legislature. The 1917 act continued the provisions of Danish law, which dated back at least to 1906, for the election of two colonial councils, one for St. Croix, the other for St. Thomas and St. John. The ordinances of these councils, when sanctioned by the King, became law. The 1917 act, in effect, continued this system. All local laws remained in force until altered or repealed by the council concerned with the approval of the President or in accordance with regulations prescribed by him. The 1936 act provided for annual joint legislative sessions of the two municipal councils—a new name for the old colonial councils—and gave this legislative assembly "power to enact legislation applicable to the Virgin Islands as a whole" subject to the conditions that it should not consider any legislation except that specified in a message from the Governor, that no bill should be enacted except by a two-thirds vote, and that every bill should be subject to gubernatorial veto and, if repassed over his veto, to Presidential veto. Under the 1954 act the legislative power of the Territory was vested in a territorywide legislative body of 11 members, the jurisdiction of which extended to "all subjects of local application"—later amended to read "all rightful subjects of legislation"—not inconsistent with the laws of the United

States applicable to the Virgin Islands. Provisions for gubernatorial and Presidential veto were continued, however. Six of the members were to be and are elected at large, two from St. Croix, two from St. Thomas, and one from St. John.

Since the 1954 act came into force, there have been a number of other enactments by the Congress looking toward greater self-responsibility on the part of the Virgin Islands: Public Law 85–224 authorized the enactment of local laws requiring the advice and consent of the legislature to gubernatorial appointees to commissions having quasi-judicial authority; Public Law 85–851 provided for the issuance of revenue bonds for certain types of projects authorized by the legislature and made it clear that there should be no political or religious test for officers and employees of the government of the Virgin Islands; Public Law 86–289 allowed the territorial attorney general to exercise some of the functions of the U.S. attorney; Public Law 88–180 provided for the issuance of general obligation bonds in certain circumstances; Public Law 88–183 transferred submerged areas bordering on the islands to the territorial government and put within its concurrent jurisdiction "parties found, acts performed, and offenses committed on property owned, reserved or controlled by the United States"; and Public Law 89–100 provided for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the local rather than the Federal Government.

It is clear from the above that the people of the Virgin Islands have had long experience in electing one branch of their government and thus in participating in the making of their own laws. It is the belief of the committee that the people and their legislature have for the most part exercised their powers in a responsible manner. They have organized a two-party system, and have identified, discussed, and voted their opinions on matters of local concern. The legislators, in turn, have debated the issues, and at times disagreed with the Washington-appointed Governor in the manner of free legislatures everywhere. They have enacted laws of local application and have levied taxes and appropriated funds sufficient for the ordinary needs of the local government without resort to direct Federal appropriations. In view of this and in view of the further facts that the governorship has become almost exclusively a local office and that the Governor, under the revised organic act, is an integral part of the legislative process with power to recommend and to veto legislation, it is the committee's view that the time is ripe for taking the progressive step toward a territorial government which is fully responsible and responsive to local needs and the local electorate which H.R. 11777 proposes. Enactment of this bill, as amended, will be a recognition that the Virgin Islands have accumulated sufficient political maturity and practice in the art of self-government to warrant this step.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 of the amended bill amends section 9, subsection (a) of the revised organic act to provide that a quorum of the legislature shall consist of eight of its members. This provision was necessitated by passage of the Reapportionment Act, Public Law 89–548, which increased the number of legislators from 11 to 15.

Section 2 amends section 9 of the revised organic act by eliminating the provision for Presidential veto as a part of the lawmaking process and by providing that a gubernatorial veto may be overridden by a two-thirds vote of all the members of the legislature.

Section 3 amends section 11 of the revised organic act and provides for the popular election of the Governor and Lieutenant Governor jointly for a 4-year term. The first election is to be held on November 3, 1970.

Section 2 also specifies the powers, duties, and responsibilities of the Governor and provides that no person who has been elected Governor for two full successive terms shall be again eligible to hold that office until one full term has intervened.

Section 4 amends section 12 of the revised organic act and provides a method of recall for removal of the Governor. The recall procedures require the approval of 75 percent of the persons registered to vote, plus the approval of the President of the United States. The approval of the President was felt necessary by the members of the committee in light of the Governor's duty to enforce all applicable Federal laws in the Virgin Islands and in light of the substantial responsibility and interest of the Federal Government in the affairs of the territory.

Section 5 deletes from the revised organic act a provision authorizing the Governor to appoint administrative assistants for St. John and St. Croix. This is in keeping with the view that such matters should hereafter be determined by the laws of the Virgin Islands.

Section 6 sets out a line of succession in the event of a vacancy, temporary or permanent, in the office of Governor or Lieutenant Governor.

Section 7 repeals a provision of existing law which bars the creation of new departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Virgin Islands government without the consent of the Secretary of the Interior.

Section 8, by amendment and through the addition of new subsections, clarifies the duties and responsibilities of the office of government comptroller. In addition, section 2 provides that effective July 1, 1967, the expenses and salaries of the office of government comptroller shall be paid by the United States from funds derived by transfer from the internal revenue collections appropriated for the Virgin Islands. This will result in a substantial savings to the Federal Government.

Section 9 provides that all salaries and expenses connected with the executive and legislative departments of the Virgin Islands shall be paid locally.

Section 10 in effect extends to the Virgin Islands the provisions of article IV, section 2, paragraph 1, and amendment XIV, section 1, of the U.S. Constitution. These are the privileges and immunities clauses of article IV and amendment XIV and the due process and equal protection clauses of the 14th amendment.

Section 11 extends to the Virgin Islands the portion of the general military laws which authorizes the President to call upon Federal or local forces in case of insurrection or other similar emergency.

Section 12 provides the effective dates for the various provisions of the act.

Section 13 states that the act shall be known as the "Virgin Islands Elective Governor Act."

THIRTY-DAY LEAVE FOR MEMBER OF UNIFORMED SERVICE WHO VOUNTARILY EXTENDS HIS TOUR OF DUTY IN A HOSTILE FIRE AREA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1659, H.R. 15748, that it be laid down, made the pending business, but not debated until after the conclusion of the morning hour.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 15748) to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize a special 30-day period of leave for a member of a uniformed service who voluntarily extends his tour of duty in a hostile fire area.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate will proceed with its consideration after the morning hour.

CHARLES B. THORNTON—INDUSTRIALIST OF THE YEAR

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a signal honor was recently bestowed upon one of my most distinguished constituents, Mr. Charles B. Thornton of Los Angeles. "Tex" Thornton is the brilliant and dynamic chairman of the board of Litton Industries, the growth company which he founded in 1953 and which, under his leadership, has since become one of America's most successful and exciting businesses.

In recognition of "Tex" Thornton's unique record of achievement and contribution to American life, the Society of Industrial Realtors recently named Mr. Thornton as the "Industrialist of the Year." In announcing his selection, SIR's spokesman said:

> The dramatic growth of Litton Industries reflects the genius and ability of its dynamic young co-founder and Board Chairman. Thornton displays the same drive and dedication in his civic activities as he has in directing his company's remarkable growth.

Thornton thus joins such outstanding industrialists as Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., of General Motors, Benjamin F. Fairless of United States Steel, and Thomas J. Watson of IBM, who have been chosen in earlier years as recipients of this honor. Like his distinguished predecessors, "Tex" Thornton has made a significant contribution to the industrial development of North America in the public interest.

I am glad to observe that the public interest has always played an important role in "Tex" Thornton's lifetime, which has included an active commitment to many worthy civic causes and organizations. As reported in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of August 7, his active participation in the war on poverty is notable evidence of his devotion to the public good. To quote from the Post-Dispatch:

> An example of Thornton's civil efforts is Litton's support of the Job Corps of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Litton, in an unusual program of industry-government cooperation, is training more than 2,000 underprivileged boys, school dropouts, who ultimately will be qualified workers in electronics, automotive repair, culinary arts, business equipment, and maintenance areas.

The Post-Dispatch is here referring to Litton's operation of the Camp Parks Job Corps Center for men near Pleasanton in Contra Costa County, Calif., which is widely recognized as being a model of antipoverty effectiveness for other Job Corps centers.

I wish to add my congratulations to "Tex" Thornton, "Industrialist of the Year." I ask unanimous consent that the Post-Dispatch article be included at this point in the RECORD.

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

INDUSTRIAL HONOR FOR C. B. THORNTON

WASHINGTON.—Charles B. Thornton, chairman of the board of Litton Industries, Inc., Beverly Hills, Calif., has been named industrialist of the year.

An independent board headed by John S. Knight, chairman of the board of Knight Newspapers, Inc., selected Thornton for the award presented annually by the Society of Industrial Realtors.

In announcing Thornton's selection, Knight said: "The dramatic growth of Litton Industries reflects the genius and ability of its dynamic, young cofounder and board chairman. Thornton displays the same drive and dedication in his civic activities as he has in directing his company's remarkable growth."

Representatives of leading business and professional organizations served on the independent board that chose Thornton from a score of top industrialists nominated by society members throughout North America. The society, a professional affiliate of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, is composed of 1000 members who specialize in meeting the real estate needs of industry.

Knight will present a trophy to Thornton at a session Nov. 14, of the society's annual convention at the Doral Beach Hotel, Miami Beach.

RECIPIENTS IN PAST

This is the eighteenth consecutive year that the society has honored an industrialist "who has made a significant contribution to the industrial development of North America in the public interest." Recipients include Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., General Motors Corp.; Benjamin F. Fairless, United States Steel Corp.; Thomas J. Watson, International Business Machines Corp.; William Allen, Boeing Airplane Co.; Thomas B. McCabe, Scott Paper Co.; Stanley C. Allyn, National Cash Register Co.; William A. Patterson, United Air Lines; Lynn A. Townsend, Chrysler Corp.; and J. Erik Jonsson, Texas Instruments, Inc.

Since he organized Litton Industries in 1953, Thornton has developed the company into one of the most remarkable growth companies in history. Sales for fiscal 1966, ending next month, are expected to pass the billion-dollar mark—almost doubling the sales total for 1963.

Litton manufactures more than 9000 products, ranging from nuclear submarines to electronic tubes that can send radio and television signals back to earth from space. Litton, which has 73,000 employees and plants in 22 states and 12 foreign countries, is the twenty-fifth largest employer in the nation. Among its products are military command and control systems, business machines and computers, materials handling, medical instruments, microwave ovens, and commercial and military shipbuilding.

JOB CORPS SUPPORT

An example of Thornton's civic efforts is Litton's support of the Job Corps of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Litton, in an unusual program of industry-government co-operation, is training more than 2000 underprivileged boys, school dropouts, who ultimately will be qualified workers in electronics, automotive repair, culinary arts, business equipment and maintenance areas.

Thornton helped introduce modern management controls into the Air Force in World War II. At one time he was the youngest colonel in the Army.

After the war, when he was 32 years old, he became director of planning for Ford Motor Co., setting up a group of management experts, including now Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, which later came to be known as the Whiz Kids.

From 1948 to 1953, he was vice president and assistant manager of Hughes Aircraft Co. In this period, Hughes' sales rose from $2,000,000 to $200,000,000 annually.

In 1953 Thornton with two other young Hughes executives purchased a small California company that produced microwave tubes and organized Litton Industries.

He is a director and executive committee member of United California Bank, Times Mirror Co., and Cyprus Mines, Inc.; director and finance and audit committee member of Union Oil Co. of California; director and finance committee member of Trans World Airlines, Inc.; and director of General Mills, Inc., Lehman Corp., and Western Bancorporation.

CIVIC, EDUCATION POSTS

He is trustee of the University of Southern California, Harvey Mudd College of Science and Engineering, and the National Security Industrial Association. He is a member of the Defense Industry Advisory Council, the Business Council, the President's Commission on the Patent System, California Institute Associates, University of Southern California Associates, West Coast Advisory Group of American Management Association, Founding Friends and Alumni Association of Harvey Mudd College, Advisory Committee of the Invest-in-America Council, and the California Committee for Bicentennial of American Free Enterprise System.

He is a consultant to the secretary of the Air Force, a member of the Special Advisory Committee to review programs of the Air Force Academy, and a director of the National Committee for International Development.

He has been director and a member of the executive committee of First Western Bank; director and chairman of the electronics industry committee, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce; director, California Merchants and Manufacturers Association; director, Los Angeles YMCA; director and chairman, Military Production Division, Electronic Industries Association; director, American Cancer Society; on the Board of Advisors, thirteenth International Management Conference; on the board of governors, Welfare Federation of Los Angeles Area; a member of the advisory group to the Economic Committee of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentarians' Conference; on the Interim Study Committee for American Free Enterprise Exposition; a member of the Secretary of the Navy's Advisory Board on Educational Requirements.

A partial listing of the awards Thornton has received: salesman of the year, Los Angeles Sales Executive Club, 1959; Merit Award, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Yeshiva University, 1963; Texan of the year, Texas Press Association, 1964; man of the year, Beverly Hills, Calif., Chamber of Commerce, 1964; business statesman of the year award, Harvard Business School Alumni Association of Southern California, 1964; Horatio Alger award, American Schools and Colleges Association, 1964; and Western Electronic Manufacturers Association medal of achievement, 1965.

Serving with Knight on the SIR award board were C. C. Cameron, Charlotte, N.C., past president of the Mortgage Bankers Association of America; W. P. Gullander, New York, president of the National Association of Manufacturers; Daniel P. Loomis, Washington, president of the Association of American Railroads; Alton V. Phillips, Seattle, president of the Associated General Contractors of America; William B. West, Cleveland, president of the Society of Industrial Realtors; and John W. Galbreath, Columbus, chairman for arrangements, SIR Industrial Award Committee.

ELECTION YEAR JITTERS ON FOOD FOR PEACE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the recent action of the House in rejecting the food-for-peace conference report can only be interpreted as a bad case of election year jitters. By a margin of 306 to 61, the House was stampeded into rejecting a superb piece of legislation because of a sideline issue that should not have been raised at all in connection with this bill. The House action seeks to deny U.S. food to the people of any country that has any trade at all with Cuba or North Vietnam. The Senate and House conferees had attempted to meet this problem earlier by denying U.S. food only to those countries trading strategic materials to Cuba or North Vietnam. To go beyond that restriction as the House did can only be regarded as an ill-advised effort to determine sensitive foreign policy issues on the basis of election year considerations.

The House action raises at least two questions:

First. Is it wise for the United States to use our food supplies as a bribe or threat to dictate the policies of other nations?

Second. Is it proper for Congress to tie the President's hands in the administration of a humanitarian program designed to assist hungry people while strengthening U.S. foreign policy and our domestic agriculture?

As one long interested in the success of our food-for-peace program, I intend to press in the conference on this matter for a substitute provision that would retain the President's authority to resolve such administrative questions in the national interest.

Congress has no right to bribe or pressure other nations into making foreign policy decisions because of our capacity to give or withhold food to hungry people. Other people are as proud and sensitive as we are about their national independence. They might under the pressure of hunger yield to such petty outside dictation. But if they did, it would be with a kind of seething resentment that would destroy any appreciation or respect for our food-for-peace efforts.

My personal hunch is that national independence and pride are such strong sentiments that even needy nations such as India would reject U.S. food rather than submit to our dictation of their international trade policy. They are presently selling a little burlap bagging to Cubans which they would have to give up for receiving our food assistance under the House action. The burlap sales are a relatively inconsequential matter—$600,000. But national integrity and pride are not inconsequential. I suspect that India would prefer to tighten her belt rather than diminish her self-respect and national pride.

It is quite possible that the dictatorial restriction requested by the House will, if sustained, lead to the collapse of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's government

and the emergence of an anti-American, pro-Communist government. Mrs. Gandhi is under continuous attack from leftists who accuse her of being a lackey of the United States. If she yielded to the demands of the House, this would add fuel to the fire now being directed against her. If she instead refused to yield to the House demand, our food would be cut off and starvation would run rampant across the Indian subcontinent—an even greater threat to the Gandhi government.

Legislating sensitive foreign policy decisions and denying the President the opportunity to use his judgment in administering an important overseas operation can cripple and eventually kill the food-for-peace program. Eight food-for-peace recipients now selling small quantities of nonstrategic material to Cuba or North Vietnam include: India, Pakistan, Brazil, Egypt, Ceylon, Morocco, Algeria, and Yugoslavia. These countries for the most part are genuinely interested in remaining neutral in the East-West struggle. They wish to live at peace and carry on relationships with both the United States and our Communist rivals. They are independent, strongly nationalistic states that resent pressure over their policies from either side. As a nation following a policy of neutrality throughout our own period of national development, we should be able to understand this sentiment. The combined total of their annual sales to Cuba and North Vietnam is an estimated $43.2 million—none of this in strategic materials. Only $203,000 of this meager total is with North Vietnam.

Yet, these countries are important food-for-peace recipients. The House restriction could prevent an estimated $860 million in concessional food-for-peace sales next year. Such a blow would lead to the collapse of the program and would have an extremely depressing effect on the American agricultural economy. The specter of hunger spreading across the underdeveloped world because of an ill-advised effort to dictate the trade policy of other nations would present an image too costly to the United States to comprehend.

Strangely enough, the proposed restriction would permit us to give food to the countries in question, but would prevent us from selling it to them on lenient terms. Furthermore, our own policy now permits us to make food and medical supplies available to Cuba. But the new restriction would deny that right to other countries.

The hasty, self-defeating action of the House diminishes the dignity and good judgment of a great country, and it ought to be corrected in the forthcoming conference.

DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED LONG-LINES COMMUNICATION FACILITIES IN ALASKA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1670, S. 2444.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2444) to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned long-lines communication facilities in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments on page 4, after line 4, to insert:

(6) In connection with soliciting offers to purchase such long-lines facilities of the Alaska Communication System the Secretary of Defense or his designee shall:

(a) Provide any prospective purchaser who requests it data on (i) the facilities available for purchase, (ii) the amounts deemed to be the current fair and reasonable value of those facilities, and (iii) the initial rates which will be charged to the purchaser for capacity in facilities retained by the Government and available for commercial use;

(b) Provide, in the request for offers to purchase, that offerors must specify the rates they propose to charge for service and the improvements in service which they propose to initiate;

(c) Provide an opportunity for prospective purchasers to meet as a group with Department of Defense representatives to assure that the data and the public interest requirements described in (a) and (b), above, are fully understood; and

(d) Seek the advice and assistance of the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska, and the Governor of Alaska or his designees, to assure consideration of all public interest factors associated with the transfer.

And, on page 6, after line 12, to insert:

(3) the sale will not be final unless and until the purchaser shall receive the requisite certificates of convenience and necessity to operate interstate and intrastate commercial communications in Alaska from the appropriate governmental regulatory bodies.

So as to make the bill read:

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

TITLE I—DEFINITIONS

SEC. 101. In this Act—

(1) "Transfer" means the conveyance by the United States of any element of ownership, including but not restricted to any estate or interest in property, and franchise rights, by sale, exchange, lease, easement, or permit, for cash, credit, or other property, with or without warranty.

(2) "Long-lines communication facilities" means the transmission systems connecting points inside the State with each other and with points outside the State by radio or wire, and includes all kinds of property and rights-of-way necessary to accomplish this interconnection.

(3) "Agency concerned" means any department, agency, wholly owned corporation, or instrumentality of the United States.

TITLE II—TRANSFER OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT-OWNED LONG-LINES COMMUNICATION FACILITIES IN AND TO ALASKA

SEC. 201. (1) Subject to the provisions of section 202, and notwithstanding provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Defense or his designee, with the advice, assistance, and, in the case of any agency not under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Defense, the consent of the agency concerned, and after approval of the President, is authorized to and shall transfer for adequate consideration any or all long-lines communication facilities in or to Alaska under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government to any person qualifying under the provisions of section 202, and may take such action and exercise such powers as may be necessary or appropriate to effectuate the purposes of this Act.

(2) Transfers under this title shall be made in accordance with the procedures and methods required by sections 203(e), (1), (2), and (3) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(e)), except that "the Secretary of Defense or his designee" shall be substituted for all references therein to "the Administrator".

(3) The requirements of section 207 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 488), shall apply to transfers under this title.

(4) The head of the agency concerned or his designee shall execute such documents for the transfer of title or other interest in property, except any mineral rights therein, and take such other action as the Secretary of Defense deems necessary or proper to transfer such property under the provisions of this title. A copy of any deed, lease, or other instrument executed by or on behalf of the head of the agency concerned purporting to transfer title or any other interest in public land shall be furnished to the Secretary of Agriculture.

(5) No interest in public lands, withdrawn or otherwise appropriated, may be transferred under this title without the prior consent of the Secretary of the Interior, or, with respect to lands within a national forest, of the Secretary of Agriculture.

(6) In connection with soliciting offers to purchase such long-lines facilities of the Alaska Communication System the Secretary of Defense or his designee shall:

(a) Provide any prospective purchaser who requests it data on (i) the facilities available for purchase, (ii) the amounts deemed to be the current fair and reasonable value of those facilities, and (iii) the initial rates which will be charged to the purchaser for capacity in facilities retained by the Government and available for commercial use;

(b) Provide, in the request for offers to purchase, that offerors must specify the rates they propose to charge for service and the improvements in service which they propose to initiate;

(c) Provide an opportunity for prospective purchasers to meet as a group with Department of Defense representatives to assure that the data and the public interest requirements described in (a) and (b), above, are fully understood; and

(d) Seek the advice and assistance of the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska, and the Governor of Alaska or his designees, to assure consideration of all public interest factors associated with the transfer.

SEC. 202. No transfer under this title may be made unless the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that—

(1) the United States does not need to retain the property involved in the transfer for national defense purposes;

(2) the transfer is in the public interest;

(3) the person to whom the transfer is made is prepared and qualified to provide, without interruption, the communication service involved in the transfer; and

(4) the long-lines communication facilities will not directly or indirectly be owned, operated, or controlled by a person who would legally be disqualified by the Federal Communications Commission from holding a radio station license under any of the terms of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

SEC. 203. The agreements by which a transfer is made under this title shall include a provision that—

(1) the person to whom the transfer is made shall, subject to the rules and regulations of any body or commission established by the State of Alaska to govern and regulate communication services to the public and of the Federal Communications Commission and all applicable statutes, treaties, and conventions, provide without interruption, the communication services involved in the transfer, except those services reserved by the United States in the transfer; and

(2) the rates and charges for such services applicable at the time of transfer shall not be changed for a period of one year from the date of such transfer unless approved by a governmental body or commission having jurisdiction.

(3) the sale will not be final unless and until the purchaser shall receive the requisite certificates of convenience and necessity to operate interstate and intrastate commercial communications in Alaska from the appropriate governmental regulatory bodies.

SEC. 204. Transfers under this title do not require the approval of the Federal Communications Commission except to the extent that the approval of the Federal Communications Commission may be necessary under section 202(4).

SEC. 205. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the gross proceeds of each transfer shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 206. The Secretary of Defense or his designee shall report to the Congress and the President—

(1) in January of each year, the actions taken under this title during the preceding twelve months; and

(2) not later than ninety days after completion of each transfer under this title, a full account of that transfer.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. Except as provided in section 204, this Act does not modify in any manner the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

SEC. 302. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Defense such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1702), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND OF THE LEGISLATION

S. 2444 would authorize the Secretary of Defense to sell or lease Government-owned, long-lines communications facilities in the State of Alaska to a private commercial carrier, or to allow the use of such facilities by permit, easement, or other form of transfer. The Secretary of Defense is to obtain the advice, assistance, and, in the case of agencies not under the jurisdiction of the Defense Department, the consent of the heads of agencies of the Government which operate long-lines communications facilities being tranferred. No sale, lease, or other transfer could be made unless the Secretary of Defense or his designee determined that the rights to be transferred were not necessary for national defense purposes, and that the transfer is in the public interest. The carrier acquiring any such facilities would be required to provide, without interruption, the communications services involved in the transfer.

Since there are no commercial long-lines communication companies operating in Alaska, that State, alone among the 50 States of the Union, depends upon the Federal Government to provide telecommunications network, facilities, and services that are required for business and other purposes by the general public. These services are now being provided by the Alaska Communication System (ACS), a Department of Defense (DOD) activity. The authority for Government operation of the ACS is an act of Congress of May 26, 1900, which specified that commercial business might be done over military telegraph cable lines in Alaska under such conditions as the Secretary of War might deem to be equitable and in the public interest. Effective July 1, 1962, the Secretary of Defense transferred responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the ACS from the Department of the Army to the Department of the Air Force.

In response to the ever-increasing requirements of the public for commercial communications services, over a period of more than 60 years the ACS has grown to the point that today it provides all kinds of long-distance telephone and telegraph services for private individuals, commercial enterprises, State and Federal civilian agencies, as well as for the Department of Defense.

The uniqueness of the communication situation in Alaska, and the ever-increasing volume of commercial business, led DOD and the Federal Aviation Agency (FAA) in the late 1950's to consider the possibility of selling their Alaskan communications facilities to enable service to the public in Alaska to be provided by a private, regulated commercial carrier. The Department of Defense has indicated that the facilities initially offered for sale will be, generally, those now operated by the ACS. Other facilities, now used primarily for defense purposes would not be sold; however, capacity on these facilities would be leased to the ACS purchaser to allow continuation of public service throughout the entire State of Alaska. The DOD facilities involved are described in appendix A.

Since the ACS facilities are not, in the main, excess to sale needs of the Department, such sale could be accomplished only with special congressional authorization. DOD, in anticipation of sale authority, has been reluctant to make even minor improvements and expansions in the system to meet the continually increasing requirements of the public. The growing gap between the capabilities of the system and the requirements of the public emphasizes the importance of a realistic new look at the communications situation in Alaska.

PRESENT DRAFT SYSTEM UNFAIR

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the administration of our present draft law is discriminatory in determining which young men will serve in our Armed Forces. For example, deferments too frequently favor those who can afford to attend college and those whose educations qualify them to enter critical occupations, so called. The plain fact of the matter is that young men with financial resources or with parents with financial resources are in a better position to secure deferment from the draft by going to college or by marrying young and having children.

Furthermore, the present system of assigning draft quotas to each State which in turn assigns quotas to local draft boards is inequitable. This results in thousands of different criteria for deferment. For instance, a draft board in Ohio may decide to induct a young man who, if he lived in another State—or for that matter in another jurisdiction in Ohio—would be deferred. Since available pools of eligible draftees differ from one draft board jurisdiction to another, consideration given to the problems of individual potential draftees varies from one draft board to the next.

Although there are broad national outlines establishing deferment criteria under present law, the intepretation of these criteria and the pressures for meeting draft quotas vary considerably.

A much fairer and equitable method for selecting men for military service could be established were the present quota system to be abolished and a national manpower pool established, along the lines of a national lottery.

Furthermore, it seems to me that the fair thing to do would be first to exhaust the draft pool of all young men 20 years of age or above who are eligible for induction under present criteria and who have not to date been drafted. Then, as has been suggested by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], 19-year-olds should be the first to be drafted to meet the Nation's military manpower needs. Approximately 2 million boys turn 19 each year. As there would be fewer deferments because of dependency in this age group, the number might well meet our needs. At least such a policy would remove the uncertainty from the lives of many youngsters now unable to plan definitely for their futures.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, let us hope that the peacetime draft can eventually be done away with and military needs be met by trained volunteers. However, during our involvement in Vietnam, it is important that the selective service law operates fairly. Unfortunately, local draft boards frequently demonstrate bad judgment in decisions such as deferments to professional athletes and others.

For example, there was the granting of a deferment from the draft to the well-known actor, George Hamilton, who claimed hardship as the sole support of his mother, who at that time was living

and is now living in his $500,000 Hollywood home. This deferment by a local draft board in New York has frequently been referred to by extremist rightwingers in my State of Ohio. But, Mr. President, no one should blame our President for the deferment of George Hamilton by a draft board in New York. This deferment was granted to the actor in 1961, when Lynda Bird Johnson was about 15 or 16 years old. Blaming this on the President by lunatic rightwing extremists in my State and other States is typical of the Birchsaps—the John Birch Society—and others.

Selective service, as now operated, no more meets military requirements in this grim war period than would horse cavalry, B–25's of World War II, or Springfield rifles used at the turn of the century. Youngsters in poor families assert that the present system has created a caste system favoring wealthier families.

Mr. President, we should establish a more logical and equitable method for inducting young men into our Armed Forces. Why not return to the lottery system of World War II, or at least remove uncertainty from the lives of young Americans by instituting more uniform and definite criteria for deferment and calling young men up for induction by age groups whether it be 19 or 20 years of age?

THE AMERICAN FISHING FLEET

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, a very important speech was made last week by Joseph Curran, president of the National Maritime Union, at the 14th national convention of the organization held in New York City. Mr. Curran announced that the weight and influence of the union which he heads, made up of 50,000 members, will be thrown behind an effort, long overdue, to revitalize and build up the American fishing fleet. That fleet is outmoded, outdated, and inefficient in these modern times when Japan and the Soviet Union are floating tremendous fleets of modern vessels which roam all the seas of the world. Year by year the United States, which once occupied a predominate position, lags further although the need for protein, which fish supply in as concentrated a form as any other food and greater than most, increases greatly. We who have had a particular interest in the maintenance and development of the American fishery welcome the support of the National Maritime Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Curran's speech printed in the RECORD.

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

The sea around us is recognized as the eventual major source of food for the expanding populations of the world.

As startling as it may seem, our Government does not have a meaningful program to develop our fishing industry to explore and take advantage of this great potential. The same story of Government neglect which applies to our merchant marine also exists with regards to our fishing fleet. We have enacted some piecemeal legislation to assist our fishing industries but it is ineffective primarily because it lacks an overall national goal. It has been further weakened by Budget Bureau attacks based on its philosophy of "knowing the cost of everything and the value of nothing."

We cannot ignore the fact that the sea around us is recognized as the eventual major source of food for the expanding populations of the world. One of the real champions in advocating the development of a fishing industry, Senator MAGNUSON, said recently that perhaps we are indifferent to the depletion of our coastal fish resources by foreign fishing fleets because we lack appreciation of the future value of these resources. "It is difficult," MAGNUSON said, "to appreciate hunger until you have been without food, and it is even more difficult to anticipate such an absence in a time of plenty."

I am sorry to say that while our Government has not recognized these potentials the Russians have.

In addition to our own future needs we should be thinking and planning in terms of the world needs—and how we will be able to meet them.

While we enact piecemeal, ineffective legislation that is made more ineffective by budgetary depreciation the Russians are busy developing a highly organized fishing industry, employing approximately 600,000 workers which last year took 5.6 million tons of fish from international waters. This development is highlighted by the fact that in 1945 the Russian catch was only 1.5 million tons. The 1965 catch put the Russians among the top five, Peru, Japan, Communist China and the United States. The Soviets are, however, not satisfied with this because they now have even greater plans for more fishing fleets of more advanced equipment and of a more widely spread operation.

For example, the Russians are presently building two 44,000-ton floating factory mother ships to operate in the Atlantic, Pacific and Indian Oceans. These ships will carry their own brood of fourteen 65-ton trawlers.

The mother ship will carry its own helicopter to search out schools of fish and coordinate the work of its satellite fishing vessels when the mother ship reaches a selected area, the trawlers will be lowered into the sea by special cranes. After taking in their haul they will be hoisted back aboard and the floating factory mother ship will move to other fishing grounds or head for home port.

The Russians regard their merchant fleet as part of their Navy; their fishing fleet plays the same role. Photographs by U.S. Navy planes show that many Russian trawlers have special electronic capabilities not normally required of fishing boats. This is part of the reason Russian scientists and military planners have at their disposal a wealth of basic data on such subjects as water temperatures, thermal water layers and other important data for waters around the world. We do not know what other information about our coastal defenses the Soviet fishing boats have been able to gain on their expeditions off our coasts. There is no reason this kind of "fishing" should be left for them alone to do.

This topic is extremely timely because our State Department is currently engaged in long, drawn-out negotiations with Russian representatives supposedly to obtain agreement on rules that will govern fishing vessels on the high seas. These negotiations are taking place while this fast growing, modern Soviet fishing fleet, with the most advanced equipment, depletes the fishing grounds only a few miles off our coast where by contrast, the U.S. fishing fleet, lacking protection, encouragement and support from our Government, withers away.

The prospects of a settlement that will be beneficial to our fishing industry are bleak, particularly when we remember that this is the same Government agency that gives aid and comfort to the foreign-flag shipping companies that take away the freight from our ships; that carries our citizens on floating firetraps and then thumbs their nose at us by trading with the Communist controlled countries.

The United States cannot continue to allow its fishing industry to go down while the State Department negotiates. No new rules beneficial to us or fair agreement is going to be reached with the Soviets as long as they can outstrip us under present conditions. Our answer has to be a full scale program to build a fishing fleet that matches any built by other nations. For the benefit of our nation, labor, management, and Government should work together to develop such a program.

This program will require a major drive to expand and modernize our fishing vessel capacity. As a beginning we should build large, fast-moving well-integrated fleets of fish factories, trawlers and scouting equipment, capable of maintaining themselves for long periods of time over great distances. The factory ships should be equipped to fresh-freeze and perhaps containerize the catch.

A system for supplying the fleet picking up their cargo and rotating their crews can be developed so as not to delay the operation.

We do not intend at this time to cover all the characteristics of a fishing fleet we believe necessary. That should be decided on the basis of careful planning. NMU is now working on more detailed proposals which, we repeat, will require government and industry as well as labor cooperation to make a reality. Expansion of the fishing vessel construction-differential subsidy will be just a beginning. In the long run, this program will bring tremendous economic, political and strategic benefits to the U.S.

Once we have achieved the necessary modernization and expansion of our fishing fleet, we can stop sitting on our own doorstep and range out to wherever the fish are, which would include the Black Sea, the Soviet backyard.

Maybe this will result in an international agreement with the Russians that is fair to the U.S. and all nations, or perhaps we will find the current agreements as they exist now more to our advantage and leave them as they are.

The inadequacy of our fleet is testified to by the fact that this country, despite the wealth of fish in nearby waters, is importing more and more fish products each year from all over the world. Some of these imports are from Russia and other Iron Curtain countries. Last year these Russian imports amounted to some half-a-million dollars which was a hundred percent increase over the previous year. From all indications this will increase from year to year. It could very well be that some of this fish we imported from Russia comes from our Georges Bank fishing grounds off our East Coast. Our program will be a positive program.

We intend to ask Congress early in the next session to appropriate sufficient funds, at least 100-million dollars, to build several proto type fishing vessels that can be used as the nucleus of a new modern fishing fleet that can successfully compete with the rest of the world.

We will also ask Congress to amend the 1936 Merchant Marine Act so as to extend the same construction subsidy assistance to the fishing industry.

Also, we will urge the Government to expand our foreign aid program to include the vast food potentials from the sea as a supplement or substitute for the fast depleting grain supplies.

We will supplement our present training program so that we can make available to the

fishing industry sufficient trained seamen to man these fleets.

IMPROVING THE GENERAL WELFARE AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF OUR AMERICAN INDIANS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, during the past 6 years, there has been considerable improvement in the general welfare and economic conditions on our Indian reservations. My colleague, Senator LEE METCALF, and I, know of these advancements, personally, on our seven Montana reservations—the Flathead and Blackfeet Reservations in western Montana, Fort Belknap, Rocky Boy, and Fort Peck Reservations on the Hi-Line, and the Crow and Northern Cheyenne Reservations in the southeastern section of the State. This was done administratively or through new programs such as the accelerated public works program and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The new Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Robert Bennett, is now holding a series of field hearings seeking advice and recommendations from the tribal leaders. A series of meetings were concluded in Billings, Mont., last week. All reports indicate that these meetings were helpful in determining the future of our Federal Indian policies—legislation or executive action which may be required to bring these policies up to date.

There is no greater champion of the American Indian than Senator LEE METCALF. The needs of Montana's reservations have always been of prime concern to him in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. Senator METCALF has sponsored and guided through the legislative process many proposals, specific and general. The most obvious examples are low-cost, self-help housing, sanitation facilities, industrial development, expanded loan services, arts and crafts development, improved education and medical services. Montana's reservations have many OEO programs, such as Headstart, Neighbor Youth Corps and community action programs—all shepherded through the bureaucratic process by LEE METCALF.

Senator METCALF is the new chairman of the Senate Interior Subcommittee on Indian Affairs. He has not as yet had sufficient time to make his influence felt but in the next Congress, I know that we will have inspired leadership in Indian affairs from a man who knows and understands the Indian problems.

Senator LEE METCALF and I feel that the Indian has not had his fair share of prosperity. We intend to see that the opportunities are available to these people and to make sure that they know how to make use of these new services. Conditions are better, the Indians are beginning to come into their own. We want to make sure that they do.

SENATOR DIRKSEN AND THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "To Senator DIRKSEN, Johnson Shifts Blame," published in the Illinois State Journal, Springfield, Ill., of October 6, 1966. The editorial is searching and far reaching, and I recommend it to Senators as a "must" to read.

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

TO SENATOR DIRKSEN, JOHNSON SHIFTS BLAME

It is a standard practice in politics for a majority party to take credit for all popular things and try to pin the blame of the unpopular on the minority.

The game reached a new height recently when the President openly blamed Sen. EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican of Illinois, for defeat of open housing sections and the Civil Rights Act.

The President, of course, had his eye on a possible "backlash" on Nov. 8 and did not want to press the issue too hard. At the same time he could tell civil rights groups the opposition was to blame for its defeat.

It was even too much for Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat of Montana, who graciously if not exactly accurately said all of the Senate was to blame.

The fact of the matter is that there are 294 Democrats and 139 Republicans in the House. The Senate has 67 Democrats and 33 Republicans.

If the President wants a measure passed, it can be done expeditiously with the Democrat majority in both houses and other levers of power installed in the White House.

He has had no trouble in obtaining promptly tax raises and acceleration of tax collections, first introduced in February and passed in March, the auto safety measures, or laws allowing federal tinkering with the economy.

On the other hand when the administration's enthusiasm is noticeably cool, it is reflected in congressional foot dragging. In spite of his seeming requests for compulsory labor unionism, four-year terms for congressmen, electoral college reforms, campaign accounting changes, proposals for trade with Communist Europe and now civil rights, the President has yet to push these measures with his full weight. The reason? His so-called sensitive antennae have shown these are not popular.

The next line of defense in the game is that conservatives control the Congress—which is equally misleading. The authoritative and impartial Congressional Quarterly traces erosion of the congressional conservative bloc to 1961.

Reasons include diminishing power of the Southern bloc, changes that stripped the House Rules Committee of power to block a bill and packed it with liberals, and the major Republican defeat in 1964.

As a result, for example, in 1965 the conservative coalition joined on 62 roll call votes. Mr. Johnson won in 80 per cent of the votes despite the conservatives in both the House and Senate.

Anybody who thinks that the President does not have the power to pass nearly any major measure he wants if he really wants it is a believer in fiction.

INDIANA NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, recently I received a very interesting letter from the director for a neighborhood youth project in Indiana, Mr. A. F. Troyer. During a period of 10 months, more than 1,300 youths have participated in the varied activities of this project, which is under the guidance of the Indiana Farmers Union.

Mr. Troyer's comments provide excellent testimony on the values which have resulted from the Neighborhood Youth Corps in my State. In order that others may learn of the success of this program, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Troyer's letter be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

INDIANA FARMERS UNION,
Indianapolis, Ind., September 7, 1966.

Hon. BIRCH BAYH,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We have now completed ten months of our current NYC programs both In-School and Out-of-School.

Over thirteen hundred young persons from low income families have benefited financially from the NYC programs. The benefits that are more of a lasting nature, however, far outweigh the financial benefits. Most of the young persons participating in the NYC program for any length of time have developed better attitudes toward work, supervisors, rights of other people, and definitely many have learned to overcome individual complexes that cause them to be backward and shy.

Over one thousand adults have cooperated with us in our NYC program in the forty counties which participated with us. Most of these adults have come to realize that in many cases the community has failed to do a job with young people, but have learned through working in our NYC programs that much can be done toward improving the capabilities and attitudes of the portion of our younger generation that has been neglected. These adults have gained the respect of the NYC enrollees, have taken an interest in them, and have assisted them in obtaining permanent employment in hundreds of cases.

Through their NYC experience, many of these youngsters are now good reliable employees in private industry and in government at the local, state, and federal levels. We have received many letters from our enrollees expressing their deep appreciation of their training and job opportunity.

We are proud of the accomplishments of our NYC programs and hope to be able to give the same assistance to many more deserving youngsters in the future.

Your past cooperation has been deeply appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

A. F. TROYER,
Project Director.

MEAT IMPORTS RISING AGAIN

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in the month of August of this year imports of beef, veal, and mutton amounted to 87.1 million pounds, an increase of about 45 percent from August of 1965, when they amounted to only 59.9 million pounds.

The figures on imports for the first 8 months of this year likewise show a sharp increase from the corresponding period of the previous year. For the period January through August of 1966 imports amounted to 525.1 million pounds, an increase of over 39 percent from the same 8 months of 1965.

Senators will recall that during 1963 and 1964 imports flooded into this country in such a torrent that it was necessary for Congress to enact special legislation—Public Law 88-482—providing

that quota limitations should be imposed on the quantity of meat permitted from foreign countries, when necessary to protect our producers. That quota legislation covers only certain types of meat, primarily fresh, chilled and frozen beef, veal, and mutton. All the figures given here relate only to those meats within the purview of Public Law 88–482. The total of meat imported, therefore, is actually larger than the figures just given. The figures given do not include canned beef, for example, imports of which are in addition to the figures cited.

Furthermore, the rate of increase may be accelerating. The August figure of 87.1 million pounds is an exceptionally high figure by any standard. It is the highest import figure for any single month, with but one exception, since the quota legislation was enacted in 1964. In only one previous month—June of this year—was it higher.

Imports of 87 million pounds a month are equivalent to an annual rate of 1,045 million pounds, almost exactly the same level as during 1963, an unhappy memory.

Mr. President, as the quantity of imports of this foreign meat has mounted through the year, we have simultaneously been forced to watch the sad, depressing spectacle of cattle prices going down and down. They have not collapsed as in 1963 and 1964; it is not that bad. But it is bad enough. They have gone down enough to inflict some painful losses on the cattle feeding industry.

Choice slaughter steers at Chicago, according to the figures compiled and published by the Department of Agriculture's Statistical Reporting Service, averaged $29.22 per hundred pounds in March of this year. From that level they have fallen steadily. In the month of record imports—June—they averaged $25.49 a hundred. In July, they were $25.41, a total decline of 13 percent. In the week ending October 6, they averaged $25.95, not greatly different.

Mr. President, a few weeks ago when the 100-million-pound imports of June came to light, I called that fact to the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture. Under the statute he is required, each 3 months, to make a formal estimate of the quantity of imports of meat to be expected to arrive during the balance of the year. It was my suggestion that in view of the sudden upsurge of imports, he should review the situation more often than quarterly, perhaps even monthly, and thus be prepared to take prompt action in case the threat of flooding imports should develop suddenly.

The Secretary did not take very kindly to that suggestion. He insisted that a quarterly estimate was sufficient and further, that he did not expect imports to increase during 1966 beyond the quantity of 800 million pounds which he had previously estimated.

Whether he still believes that imports will not exceed 800 million pounds this year, in view of the upsurge in August, is not known. I am a little apprehensive myself. Past experience has made me skittish, when assurances are received from official sources.

If imports during the remainder of the year should continue at the August rate, the total for the year would exceed the Secretary's estimate by a substantial margin.

Under all the circumstances it is still my hope that the Secretary will keep the level of imports under constant review, with a view to imposing the quotas if necessary.

Furthermore, serious consideration should be given to possible revisions in the quota legislation. The language of the law provides that imports will not be permitted to exceed 725 million pounds. But it then contains an escalation clause permitting this import figure to be increased. According to the Secretary's most recent announcement, quotas will not be imposed in the current situation unless the estimated import level reaches 979 million pounds. This escalation clause had to be accepted as the price of securing administration approval of Public Law 88–482, and avoiding a veto by the President. However, it is apparent that the allowable escalation provides a large loophole for additional imports, and much damage might occur before quotas could be imposed.

If it should happen that this loophole results in serious injury to the American cattle industry, certainly a change in the law would be in order.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the Secretary's most recent public announcement giving his estimate of imports for 1966.

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

NO CHANGE IN MEAT IMPORT ESTIMATES IN CALENDAR 1966, FREEMAN REPORTS

WASHINGTON, September 29, 1966.—Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman today said that the fourth quarterly estimate of meat imports into the United States during all of 1966 again places the expected total at about 800 million pounds. This is the same as the estimate announced in June.

He indicated that this quantity would not at this time require Presidential action to invoke meat import quotas for 1966.

The Secretary also noted that cattle prices to farmers and ranchers in the U.S. continue to hold up and are likely to average about 10 to 15 percent above those of 1965.

Secretary Freeman pointed out that the indicated volume of meat imports is 18.3 percent—almost 180 million pounds—below the estimated volume required to trigger imposition of a quota. Stronger prices in the U.S. have brought imports this year to a level somewhat higher than the 614 million pounds in 1965 and the 740 million pounds in 1964. This year's imports, however, are sharply lower than the 1,048 million pounds imported in 1963, the last full year prior to enactment of the meat import quota program.

Under legislation (P.L. 88–482) enacted in August 1964, if imports of certain meats—primarily beef and veal—during any calendar year are estimated to equal or exceed 110 percent of the adjusted base quota for that year, the President is required to invoke that quota on meat imports. The adjusted base quota for 1966 is 890.1 million pounds. The level of estimated imports which would trigger its imposition is 110 percent of this quota, or 979.1 million pounds.

Secretary Freeman said the estimate of fresh, chilled or frozen cattle meat and meat of goats and sheep, other than lamb, which will be imported is based on actual imports through July 1966, plus detailed trade surveys by agricultural attachés and other information. The tabulation given below shows that imports through July amounted to 438 million pounds. Imports through June totalled 377 million pounds, 100 million pounds of which entered in the month of June. Imports during July, however, dropped to 61 million pounds.

Pursuant to the law, the Department will continue to make quarterly determinations of import prospects to advise the President of any changes that may occur, Secretary Freeman said.

Imports of meat subject to Public Law 88–482, by month, 1965, and January through July, 1966

[Million pounds]

Month:	1965	1966
January	28.2	51.4
February	34.5	60.3
March	68.7	49.4
April	32.4	63.3
May	52.3	52.0
June	42.1	100.2
July	58.5	61.4
August	59.9	
September	62.2	
October	64.4	
November	57.3	
December	53.7	

METROPOLITAN REFORM

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, in recent years local government officials have been subjected to tremendous pressure to seek property tax revenue for provision of needed public services. The relative ability of localities to deal with their public service needs varies greatly. This situation is particularly acute in our metropolitan areas where each community has its own zoning and land-use control without reference to its neighbors and to the urban area as a whole.

The typical metropolitan picture today finds some local communities siphoning off lucrative types of development to increase their tax base for production of revenue in excess of expenditures, while other communities seek to keep governmental costs at a minimum by only permitting low-density development. One community will reap the tax revenue advantage derived from the location of a major plant or large regional shopping center within its borders while neighboring communities bear the costs of the spillover effects in educating the plant employees' children or grappling with the traffic generated by the new development. The economic and fiscal effects of these "revenue producers" have placed local governing bodies in metropolitan areas under heavy pressure to zone large stretches of land for commercial and industrial purposes. Thus the property tax in these instances has been converted into an instrument of metropolitan disunity and fiscal reasoning has become a major justification for zoning changes. State policy, however, can do much to minimize this competitive scramble for tax base among metropolitan area local governments by equalizing local government finances so that fiscal incentives for zoning are reduced.

A paper prepared by two members of the staff of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations for the 1966

National Conference of the American Institute of Planners suggests solutions to overcome the local property tax-fiscal zoning game. Several moderate, politically realistic proposals are suggested on both the zoning and tax fronts. I believe these proposals can go a long way toward harmonizing the principles of local home rule with the growing need for a more equitable method of taxing land resources within our metropolitan areas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this paper, entitled "Metropolitan Zoning and Tax Equalization Reforms—Cushioning the Impact of the Divisive and Regressive Property Tax," be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

METROPOLITAN ZONING AND TAX EQUALIZATION REFORMS—CUSHIONING THE IMPACT OF THE DIVISIVE AND REGRESSIVE PROPERTY TAX

(Prepared for the National Conference of the American Institute of Planners, Portland, Oreg., Aug. 14, 1966, by James Pickford and John Shannon, senior analysts with the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations)

The first wave of metropolitan reorganizers, propelled by their efficiency principles, attempted to sweep aside the disorderly array of municipalities clustered around the center city and leave in their wake one community with one government. Stunned by the massive resistance to this all out assault on the principles of local autonomy, the second wave of reformers sought to pick up some political support with the federation compromise. Under the federation approach the outer shell—community identification—of little principalities would remain the same. However, those functions of an areawide character would be shifted to a regional government. The surrender of some local autonomy would be at least partially compensated by representation on the areawide government. As is well known, the list of accomplishments is short, with innumerable qualifications.

A fine-grained look at metropolitan governmental reorganization and cooperation, at present being nurtured by the third wave of metropolitan reorganizers, indicates a continuing series of adaptations for the old workhorses of reorganization—annexation, use of extraterritorial powers, intergovernmental contracting. These adjustments to our intergovernmental system are incremental rather than revolutionary changes. They clearly underscore the constraints placed on reform by political reality. In order to maximize public support for structural changes, the third wave of reformers have learned to minimize the radical character of their proposed innovations.

THE PROPERTY TAX—AN INSTRUMENT OF DISUNITY

The purpose of this paper is twofold: first, to trace out the primary factors that have converted the property tax into an instrument of metropolitan disunity and second, to suggest ways and means to take some of the wind out of the sails of the local property tax-fiscal zoning game.

What are the rules of the game? Actually, there are just two—local autonomy and "winner takes all." In essence, this local autonomy means the city fathers can determine the way land will be used, the amount of the property tax payoff (via the tax assessment and rate route), and the size of the expenditure commitment (public service levels and costs).

The second rule—winner takes all—brings the fiscal zoning game into focus. For example, there is always the hope that a large share of the local tax burden can be exported via the pricing system to near and distant neighbors by snagging the giant shopping center, the industrial research park, or the massive public utility installation.

Operating under a curious logic that goes back at least to the Domesday Book of William the Conqueror, each autonomous principality has the unchallenged and exclusive right to protect and to pump all taxable resources within its domain. This winner take all rule, perhaps, made sense or at least had a few baneful effects in a rural economy. However, with the property tax in 1966 accounting for 85 percent of local tax revenue, the typical metropolitan picture today finds some local communities siphoning off lucrative types of development to increase their tax base for production of revenue in excess of expenditures, while others seek to keep governmental costs at a minimum by only permitting low-density development. Fiscal reasoning is frequently disguised or not officially recognized as justification for zoning changes actually designed to carry out fiscal policy. But it is indeed a rare case where elaborate relationships between housing costs, family incomes, number of school children, and other governmental services are not figured in as arguments for or against zoning changes.

Although by itself, zoning based on areawide planning will not solve disparity problems, it is nevertheless an indispensable part of the solution. Adjusting planning responsibilities so that larger units can tackle larger problems, and equalizing local government finances so that incentives for fiscal zoning are eliminated, are also part of the solution.

The individual proposals advanced in this paper for zoning and property tax reforms are not revolutionary. While solutions have been advanced for zoning and property tax changes that would substantially reduce metropolitan disunity, most appear too far from the status quo to gain wide acceptance. However, if the problem is attacked on both fronts with more moderate, politically realistic proposals, it is believed that progress can be made in minimizing metropolitan disunity.

RESTRICTING LOCAL ZONING AUTHORITY

For local government to act responsibly, its units must be large enough to consider issues in context and balance the needs of diverse groups of people. Local governments, based on either limited geographical or limited functional jurisdiction, acquire a higher degree of special interest and, consequently, are more likely to practice fiscal zoning. Small suburban municipalities often fall into this special interest category and may, indeed, have incorporated specifically to gain or protect a specially advantageous fiscal position. Larger municipalities and counties, in contrast, usually represent a diversity of viewpoints which make fiscal zoning objectives less dominant. Thus, reservation by the State legislature of zoning authority to large municipalities or counties would reduce the ability of the small interest municipalities to practice fiscal zoning.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has suggested a way for gearing in the planning structure of metropolitan areas to facilitate more effective county-municipal planning and zoning relationships.[1] Under the proposal, the county (a) reviews and approves certain planning and zoning actions of existing municipalities between 5,000 and 30,000 population; (b) exercises its planning and zoning authority in all existing municipalities of less than 5,000 population; and (c) exercises its planning and zoning authority in all future incorporations within the county until the population of that municipality exceeds 30,000 within its territory.

The proposal, acknowledging political reality, does not remove the power to zone or plan from municipalities of more than 5,000 persons. Rather, it subjects certain municipal actions to an approval procedure by a larger unit of government and, in specified instances, review by other municipalities. Municipalities must refer any planning and zoning proposals to the county that would have the effect of (a) changing the types of use of real property bordering major county or State highways and parks; (b) decreasing the front yard setback or minimum lot width of any property abutting any such county or State highway or park; (c) connecting any new street into any such highways; (d) connecting new drainage lines into existing channel lines; and finally (e) reducing residential densities to less than three families per acre. These categories include virtually all local planning or zoning actions likely to have an effect beyond the corporate limits. Thus, the absolute authority of the little principality to determine its land use is subject to the broader public interest of the larger unit of government.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL EQUALIZATION

In contrast to this traditional metropolitan reform approach—restructuring planning responsibilities of local jurisdictions—proposals to compensate for loss of tax base and for necessary land use adjustments must be directed to offset fiscal disparities among governments in a metropolitan area. The thrust of the following approaches is essentially to equalize local property tax loads among local jurisdictions in metropolitan areas, thereby reducing the incentives for fiscal zoning. And not only will these actions help remove the incentives for local officials to pursue fiscal zoning practices; they also appear to meet the test of political realism for putting the programs into practice.

Planners, therefore, might consider lending their support to State action to bring the property tax more in line with the principle of federalism by limiting local property tax rate decisions to the financing of essentially local or municipal-type services.

School equalization policy: In order to secure a more even distribution of tax revenue generated by major industrial, commercial, and utility uses, this policy calls for the State to partially neutralize local property tax differentials by requiring (1) that all classes of property within the State contribute equally to a minimum school program through a State-mandated local property tax rate levied in each county, and (2) that collections in excess of a specified per pupil expenditure be transferred to the State for redistribution to less wealthy counties.[2] Typically, school rates account for about half of the total local rate. Thus, State action designed to secure a more equal distribution of the property tax resource behind each pupil would also substantially reduce total local property tax differentials.

The time has come to overthrow the concept that the winner takes all the revenue advantages that may flow from an industrial or regional shopping center location. The pressing demands for higher public service levels no longer permit the grossly inequitable distribution of property tax resources. The quality of a child's education should not hinge on whether an industrial plant

[1] 1967 State Legislative Program of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Washington, D.C., September 1966, p. 513.

[2] See legislation suggested by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, *ibid.*, p. 233.

is located within the school district. While this partial equalization policy still acknowledges the primary claim of the place of residence of the plant, it also recognizes the need for a more uniform distribution of taxable resources to finance the spillover burdens that result from commutation and the fractionation of local government.

While the champions of local autonomy may view this proposal as extremely damaging to their cause, it can be argued with some justification that it prevents a bad situation from getting much worse. Unless the advocates of local autonomy are willing to make some concessions, more radical remedies will be imposed by the State. Adoption of this policy would go a long way toward eliminating fiscal zoning practices—a force that is tending to balkanize the metropolitan community—and insure the demise of industrial tax havens.

If we follow this school equalization principle, the truly local property tax could be rationalized on a benefits received basis and the tax would approximate a moderate users' charge. It would finance such general government services as the courts, police, sanitation, and fire services, as well as such local facilities as neighborhood parks and streets.

Because welfare and educational programs have assumed vital importance for the well-being of the State and the nation, the quality of these services should not be determined by the accidents of geography, the size of the local property tax base, or the willingness of local tax rate authorities to underwrite such a program. Once we fully accept the idea that education and welfare programs have acquired State and national character, we are then either in a position to shift most of this financial burden off the back of the local property tax and onto the broader shoulders of State and Federal revenue producers, or to embark on extensive State or Federal equalization programs that can effectively neutralize the accidents of geography and the variations in local fiscal capacity.

In the case of many public welfare and health programs, we have already taken the nonproperty tax route and shifted responsibility upward. In the last thirty years, the Federal and State governments have taken over responsibility for both the treatment and the prevention of indigency—responsibility that historically had rested with the family and local community.

The growing public concern today about disparities in educational opportunity clearly reflects sharp increase in public awareness of the fact that education has lost its local character. Significant changes in the conventional wisdom of financing educational services are being widely discussed.

The Advisory Commission has prepared suggested legislation to eliminate intercommunity disparities in educational opportunity. The Commission suggests that a basic program at an adequate expenditure level ($500 per pupil) be financed jointly at the State and the county level. The program would gather the property tax resources of the entire State in suport of a mandated minimum level of per pupil expenditures in local districts. This would eliminate those causes that have given birth to the practice of fiscal zoning to either (1) shield certain properties from the burdens of financing education, or (2) reduce the cost of operating public schools in particular districts.

OTHER PROPERTY TAX REFORMS

Two other property tax reforms, full disclosure assessment policy and hardship relief policy, are of particular interest to planners: the first, because it could set off badly needed assessment reforms; and the second, because of its impact in equalizing public service and economic disparities among communities in metropolitan areas.

Full disclosure assessment policy: Perhaps the most promising State reform policy is simply to advocate that property taxpayers be given a full and complete report on the fractional assessment practices of local tax officials.

A full disclosure assessment policy rests on the premise that if local assessors deviate from the State legal valuation standard (full value in most States), property owners have a right to know what fraction of estimated market value is being used for tax assessment practices. Only with this assessment ratio information can the property owner readily determine whether his assessment is fair. To put the issue in another way, if a local assessor is attempting to assess property at 30 percent of market value, this fact should be made as public as possible in order to minimize the number of inequitable assessments. In the absence of full disclosure, the so-called "public" tax roll becomes a convenient graveyard in which the local assessor can bury his mistakes.

There are two reasons for believing that a full disclosure policy might be able to trigger more far-reaching assessment reforms. First, while the great mass of taxpayers may not be particularly interested in beating the drums for the selection of assessment officials on the basis of demonstrated ability, they can be expected to be more receptive to a policy which would enable them to judge the fairness of their own assessments. Second, a full disclosure policy would dramatize assessment inequalities, and thereby generate more support from the general public and the tax officials for proposals calling for institutional and administrative reforms.

Suggested legislative language for implementing a full disclosure policy is set forth in a model property tax bill prepared by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.[3]

Hardship property tax relief policy: Administrative reforms, however, fall short of going to the heart of the property tax problem. Or to put it in another way, if by some stroke of a magic wand the local assessor could equalize all property tax assessments at full value, or some uniform percentage thereof, the collection of this tax would still create special hardships for property owners with low incomes.

Although the value of the family residence served as a fairly good proxy of ability to pay taxes in a rural society, total household income stands out as a far more precise measure of taxable capacity in our modern urban society.

The point must be emphasized that an affluent society should be able to finance its public services without forcing low income households through the property tax wringer.

Perhaps the most notable attempt to draw the regressive stinger from the property tax can be found in Wisconsin's 1964 tax credit plan that provides substantial property tax relief to low income elderly persons—both homeowners and renters meeting specified income criteria. This tax relief program is financed from State funds and administered by the Income Tax Division of the Wisconsin State Tax Department.

The Wisconsin legislature took the position that if an elderly householder has to turn over more than 5 percent of total income to the residential property tax collector, he was confronted with an extraordinary burden and that amount in excess of 5 percent is either refunded by the State to the property owner, or applied as a direct credit against his State income tax if the taxpayer falls in that category.

The critical need is to convince State legislative bodies that (a) household income is the most effective measure of ability to pay taxes, and (b) that the State (not the local governments) should assume responsibility for financing a property tax rebate program for those persons deemed to be carrying excessive property tax loads in relation to family income.

This proposal, of course, will not please those advocating that rates and taxes, levied only on unimproved capital value, would have beneficial effects on urban land use patterns. It would, in some instances, have instead the effect of retaining land in less than its highest and best use. Many of the elderly and the poor, who have homes in neighborhoods where land values are rising as commercial and apartment uses replace single-family uses, would be "protected" and thus frustrate those whose primary objective is a rational land use pattern. In its pure form, the land tax sacrifices the poor on the altar of highest and best use—a situation that the political leadership in most countries found politically intolerable. "Hardship" exemptions to permit such people to retain their homes and farms in these transitional neighborhoods have been enacted thus negating the objective of the use of this tax to influence land use patterns.

It should be noted that this type of property tax relief, geared to family income, moves in the "right direction" from the standpoint of intercommunity equalization. Because the poor tend to cluster together and because the rich do likewise, the mailman would deliver more property tax refund checks in low income communities than he would in wealthier municipalities. This should interest those persons seeking to reduce public service and financial disparities among municipalities in metropolitan areas.

CONCLUSION

All of the approaches discussed above are based on recognition that the best way to deal with some of our principal difficulties is indirectly, not by frontal attack. Three considerations should be kept in mind. First, as long as planning controls are run by local governments heavily dependent upon the local real property tax, this will act as a severe brake on progress unless planners develop more sophisticated notions of how tax devices might be used to reduce fiscal zoning incentives. Second, the problem of rectifying unfair treatment of property owners will come from raising the standards of local public administration rather than from creating new legal rights, enforceable in court. Finally, as Norman Williams has stated:

"Much of American planning and planning controls are now in the service of some of the more unattractive aspects of our life: social snobbery, exclusionism, the anti-tax hysteria, and so on. Now the underlying interethnic strains have been an historic problem in a country such as ours, and are certainly obvious now. Yet the long term period is toward a wider effectiveness for the democratic ideal, of tolerance and equal opportunity and mutual respect, extending into more areas of life. For some things we can depend on this; and for some we shall have to wait upon it." [4]

---

[3] See *ibid.*, preparation of assessment ratio studies and publication of assessment ratio information, pp. 129ff.; and effect of assessment ratio evidence, pp. 134ff. For analysis of property tax issues, see the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, *The Role of the States in Strengthening the Property Tax*, 2 Volumes, June 1963.

[4] Norman Williams, Jr., "Development Controls and Planning Controls: The View From 1964," *Proceedings of the 1964 Annual Conference*, American Institute of Planners, Washington, D.C., p. 87.

UTAH SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA PLAYS IN ATHENIAN AMPHITHEATER

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it has been hard to put into words what it meant to the people of Utah to have their symphony orchestra play in the 2,000-year-old Odeon of Herodes Atticus Amphitheater in Athens, Greece, recently.

And it has been equally difficult for those of us who were fortunate enough to accompany the orchestra to Greece, and to participate in the opening concert and the events which surrounded it, to pass on to others the special quality of the occasion.

But Harold Lundstrom, Deseret News music editor, has caught the pride and glory of the visit, as well as the color and the spirit in a feature article, entitled "A New Greek Odyssey," and I ask unanimous consent that it be carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

A NEW GREEK ODYSSEY

(By Harold Lundstrom)

"The grand objective of traveling is to see the shores of the Mediterranean. On these shores were the four great empires of the world—the Assyrian, the Persian, the Greek, and the Roman. All our religion, most all of our arts, almost all that sets us above the savage has come to us from the shores of the Mediterranean."—Dr. SAMUEL JOHNSON (1709–1784).

The Utah Symphony Orchestra's Greek Odyssey was 84 musicians arriving in Athens, not on the winged horse Pegasus, but in a chartered TWA Boeing 707, non-stop from New York . . . And it was their coming into the bustling capital of Greece not stealthily in a Trojan Wooden Horse, but being enthusiastically hailed by the official Greek Travel and Athens Festival agencies . . . It was also not to defeat Greece in any kind of physical encounter but to win the warm and friendly Athenians through the great and inspiring art, music.

The Symphony Odyssey was rehearsing in the downtown old, but not ancient, up on the third floor Rex Theater . . . And it was to meet an always smiling operator of an elevator (that was ancient), and a half dozen of the most efficient stage hands in the business . . . It was also to see a dozen Greek music critics (from Athens' 14 daily newspapers) and a half-dozen other rehearsal listeners become quietly excited when Princess Sophia and Princess Irene, sisters to King Constantine, and a half-hour later, their Queen Mother, widow of the late King Paul, arrive and sit in on every rehearsal proceedings . . . And it was to watch out the window when the three made their exit onto the sidewalk three stories below and see a crowd of a thousand Athenians applaud them warmly as they entered their cars . . . And it was to reflect that in the 25-year-history of the Utah Symphony Orchestra, it had never before experienced the friendliness of royalty attending its rehearsals. . . .

The symphony odyssey was to see the presidents and secretaries, and their wives, from the 36 Rotary Clubs in Greece plus another hundred local Rotarians and wives fete their international president, Richard L. Evans, and Mrs. Evans, at a banquet in the plush Grande Bretagne Hotel. Though they were able to include only two days in Athens from their hectic schedule of visiting Rotary Clubs throughout Europe, Elder and Mrs. Evans couldn't have left a more enthusiastic group of admirers if they had stayed a month—and the cause of people-to-people understanding was impressively enhanced. . . .

The Symphony Odyssey was the undreamed-of compliment to Christopher Athas when he was personally served by the Queen Mother at a private buffet supper at the Royal Palace. The modest Salt Lake pharmacist, understandably embarrassed, remonstrated about his being served by Her Majesty, but she interrupted him to say, "This is my privilege in appreciation for your having done so much for both our countries." . . . And it prompted Sen. FRANK E. MOSS, who was officially representing the United States at the Utah Symphony Orchestra concerts and functions, to say to Mr. Athas when they motored back to their hotel: "Chris, can I touch you?"

The Symphony Odyssey was Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY cabling from Washington, D.C.: "My warmest salutations and best wishes to the Utah Symphony on its initial performance in the Athens Festival and my special compliments to Maestro Abravanel, the members of the Utah Sypmphony, to President Ashton, and to Miss Gina Bachauer, the guest performer with the Symphony in Athens. I send the best wishes of the American people for a noteworthy performance in Athens and in the concerts which follow" . . . And Miss Bachauer's cable, in the opposite direction, to Utah's Gov. Calvin L. Rampton: "I am deeply touched by the honor you have graciously conferred on me. I am proud to be an honorary citizen of the State of Utah and as such I am personally proud of the triumphs of the Utah Symphony Orchestra and Maestro Abravanel in Greece. Your newest citizen salutes you." It was also Miss Bachauer telling her husband, the British conductor, Alex Sherman, in their car on the way from the United States Embassy, where the honorary citizenship was conferred by Senator Moss and U.S. Ambassador Phillips Talbot, to the 2,000-year-old Odeon of Herodes Atticus Amphitheater, while I sat in the back seat holding her long black concert gown: "Alec, you better be good to me. If you don't, I'll go to Utah where I am—but you are not—a citizen". . . .

The Symphony Odyssey was Maurice Abravanel returning to the city of his birth, Salonika (Thessoloniki is the Greek's word for it) in the happiest of times with its centuries-old trade fair that was attracting 120,000 persons daily, an international film festival, an American jazz festival, and an American gospel singing ensemble . . . At the three Athens concerts, the breathtaking and inspiring Acropolis was high above us; at the two Salonika concerts held in the Theater of the Forest atop the highest mountain, the beautiful twinkling lights of the city, the trade fair, and the harbor and ships were all visible far below us, and it was also breathtaking . . . And the significance of being in Greece came with an impact Sunday morning on top of the Mediterranean Hotel when our genial host, John A. Vafiades, retired U.S. Consul to Salonika, said, "Do you see that mountain top above the clouds?" as he pointed southwest, far across the Aegean Sea: "That's Mount Olympus! home of the Greek gods you studied when you were a school boy."

The Symphony Odyssey was the great round of applause, and the song, "For He's a Jolly Good Fellow," given the young violinist, John Steiner, when he received a cable in Salonika during Sunday lunch that he was the father of a seven-pound son in Salt Lake City . . . And it was the mothers in the orchestra—Katherine Peterson, for one of many examples—who became very homesick for their children . . . It was also Lucy Abravanel accidentally dropping her watch into the Aegean Sea near Athens and having her husband, Maurice, say, "There is nothing worse for a watch than salt water." Which prompted Lucy immediately to drop it in a glass of fresh water—"to wash out the salt" . . . It was Alice Athas, always going at full speed, sending bouquets to every Greek official who was lending "his good offices" for the success of the Utah Symphony Orchestra's participation in the Athens Festival . . . Appropriately, the Symphony Odyssey was also Mrs. John M. (Glenn) Wallace (president of the Utah Civil Ballet) being introduced and toasted dozens of times at banquets, receptions, and dinner parties for her work as a founder of the Utah Symphony Orchestra and as second president of its Board of Directors during its early and critical days.

And the Symphony Odyssey was a group of Athens teenagers watching as a bus returned with members of the Orchestra from the opening night concert. Recognizing the musicians by their formal attire, the teenagers sent up a round of applause and "Bravos!" that made every single effort of the Utah Symphony's getting to the Athens Festival and its gracious Greeks worthwhile.

ASTRONAUTS RECOGNIZE PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE PROGRAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to a significant ceremony that took place on September 17, the opening day of the Second Inter-American Conference of the Partners of the Alliance in Rio de Janeiro. Mr. James H. Boren, Director of the Partners of the Alliance programs, presented to the people of Brazil a letter from Astronaut Thomas P. Stafford, certifying that the postage stamp affixed to his letter and autographed by both Stafford and Eugene Cernan, and carried by them in Gemini IX, was in fact the first stamp to orbit the earth.

Last March 14, the Government of Brazil issued a blue and green airmail stamp to honor the Alliance for Progress and the United States and Brazilian States participating in the Partners of the Alliance program in their country. Astronaut Stafford carried several of these Brazilian stamps with him on the recent Gemini IX space mission.

At the time of the presentation, Boren noted that Astronaut Stafford is a member of the executive board of the Texas Partners of the Alliance, who are joined with Peru, and is also serving as an adviser to the Oklahoma Partners in their activities with Mexico. Boren stated:

I think it significant that a U.S. Astronaut who is working in a Texas-Peru Partnership and advising a Mexico-Oklahoma activity carried a Brazilian stamp honoring all citizens of the Americas. This is in keeping with the spirit of the Alliance for Progress.

Mr. President, Missouri takes added pride in announcing this space first because of the fact that the Gemini IX mission was carried out in a Missouri-made capsule of McDonnell Aircraft of St. Louis. Missouri was the 10th State to be joined in partnership with a State in Brazil. Recently a Missouri program development team traveled to their partner area of Para to lay the groundwork for cooperation and interchange between the peoples of Para and Missouri.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter of September 12 from Lt.

Col. Thomas P. Stafford, the news story of the presentation noted in the Brazil Herald for September 21, and the remarks of Mr. Boren at the ceremony be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, MANNED SPACECRAFT CENTER,
Houston, Tex., September 12, 1966.

Mr. JAMES M. BOREN,
Director, Partners of the Alliance, Alliance for Progress, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: I regret that my duties in the Apollo program prevent me from participating in the second Inter-American Conference of the Partners of the Alliance to be held in Rio de Janeiro. I am very happy to be associated with the efforts of the peoples of the Americas, who are working through the partnership program, to help to realize the objectives of the Alliance for Progress.

Attached to this letter is one of the Partners of the Alliance stamps which was issued by Brazil in recognition of citizen level participation in the Alliance. This stamp was carried by me in the flight of Gemini IX, carried out by Gene Cernan and me on June 3, 1966.

I think it would be particularly appropriate at the time of the Conference in Rio de Janeiro for this stamp to be presented to the people of Brazil and symbolically to all citizens participating in the great work in the Alliance for Progress. I would, therefore, appreciate your making the presentation in my behalf.

Sincerely,

THOMAS P. STAFFORD,
Lieutenant Colonel, USAF,
NASA Astronaut.

[From the Brazil Herald, Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo, Sept. 21, 1966]

BRAZIL'S COMMEMORATIVE STAMP ORBITS ABOARD GEMINI NINE

RIO DE JANEIRO.—A Brazilian "Partners of the Alliance" postage stamp, carried by Astronaut Tom Stafford on his Gemini 9 orbits around the world, was presented to the Brazilian people by Jim Boren, Director of the Partners of the Alliance Program, in a ceremony Monday before the 243 participants at the Second Inter-American Partners of the Alliance Conference. The stamp was accepted by Brazilian Ambassador Pio Corréa on behalf of the Brazilian people.

"It is a genuine pleasure to present to the people of Brazil and symbolically to all citizens of the Americas participating in the work of the Alliance for Progress this Partners of the Alliance stamp—the first stamp to orbit the earth," Boren said in the presentation ceremony.

Boren said that when Astronauts Thomas Stafford and Eugene Cernan circled the earth in Gemini 9 they were conducting a search for greater knowledge and understanding about the universe, but that their flight was also a great flight for the Alliance for Progress.

"When Gemini 9 made its flight Astronaut Tom Stafford carried with him this Partners of the Alliance stamp. I think it significant that a United States astronaut who is working in a Texas-Peru partnership and advising a Mexico-Oklahoma activity carried a Brazilian stamp honoring all citizens of the Americas. This is in keeping with the spirit of the Alliance for Progress."

Astronaut Stafford is a member of the Board of Directors of the Texas Partners of the Alliance, and an advisor to the Oklahoma Partners of the Alliance.

REMARKS OF JAMES M. BOREN, DIRECTOR, PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE PROGRAMS, UPON PRESENTING PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE STAMP TO AMBASSADOR PIO CORREA

When Astronauts Thomas Stafford and Eugene Cernan circled the earth in the flight of Gemini 9 on June 3, 1966, they were conducting a search for greater knowledge and understanding about the universe. But that flight of Gemini 9 was also a great flight for the Alliance for Progress.

Astronaut Stafford is a member of the Board of Directors of the Texas Partners of the Alliance and an advisor to the Oklahoma Partners of the Alliance. He is an active partner and he knows of the work all of you are doing in this program.

He also knows of the great honor which was bestowed on your efforts when Brazil issued the Partners of the Alliance stamp earlier this year.

When Gemini 9 made its flight, Astronaut Tom Stafford carried with him this Partners of the Alliance Stamp. I think it is significant that a United States Astronaut who is working in a Texas-Peru partnership and advising in a Mexico-Oklahoma activity carried a Brazilian stamp honoring all citizens of the Americas. This is in keeping with the spirit of the Alliance for Progress.

It is a genuine pleasure to present to the people of Brazil and symbolically to all citizens of the Americas participating in the work of the Alliance for Progress this Partners of the Alliance stamp—the first stamp to orbit the earth.

THE TWO CHINAS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, occasionally in this business a fellow reads an editorial which so completely squares with his own line of thought that he immediately puts it down in the "I-wish-I-had-said-that" category.

Today's lead editorial in the Washington Daily News is a case in point. In my opinion, the editorial writer makes an unanswerable argument against the recognition of Red China and its admission to the United Nations at this juncture of history. He also points out with supreme clarity the differences which have evolved in the degrees of personal opportunity and human happiness in Free China under Chiang Kai-shek compared with those developing in Red Communist China under Mao.

All in all, this is an editorial which I think Congress and the country should read and study carefully. I ask that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

THE TWO CHINAS

When the Red Army swept to power in China in 1949 and Chiang Kai-shek's beaten Nationalist forces retreated to the island of Taiwan, many governments welcomed the communist regime with diplomatic recognition, trade and cultural exchange. The communists were widely regarded as the "real" rulers of China, and the Nationalists as justly bound for the dustbin of history.

But look how that picture has changed. Red China celebrated its 17 years of power (on Oct. 1) at a time of internal convulsion and increasing international isolation and contempt. The Red Guards are on the rampage, Communist Party officials are under attack, Mao is hysterically hailed as a new god, and global war is preached by his new heir apparent, Lin-Piao. The men in power are on the outs with their ex-patron, the Soviet Union, former friend, India, erstwhile axis-ally Indonesia, and African nations that welcomed Peking officials only to discover they were subversive agents.

Nationalist China celebrated yesterday, the 55th anniversary of its founding. Chiang has matched Mao in longevity, and far surpassed him in the happiness he has brought to his people these past 17 years.

Based on the solid foundation of land reform, the economy of Taiwan has increased fivefold the past dozen years. The 12 million populace enjoys one of the highest standards of living in Asia. The United States was able to end its economic aid a year ago. Today Nationalist China not only sells its sugar, TV sets, air conditioners and fans thruout Southeast Asia, but maintains a considerable foreign aid program of its own, chiefly in Africa. There is still no perfect democracy on Taiwan, but there is infinitely more freedom than on the mainland.

This contrast between a communist China full of nastiness and turmoil and a Nationalist China that is a model of development and prosperity is not merely interesting. It is important. It is important that the security and independence of Nationalist China be upheld.

Shortly at the United Nations will come the annual effort to give the communists the China seat, to the exclusion of Nationalist China. Hopefully it will fail. There are governments that want Red China in the UN in the sincere belief that as a UN member, the Peking regime would be "pressured" into toning down its belligerence and would agree to peace in Southeast Asia, disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. (We have our doubts on that.) But the majority of nations that would be willing to take that chance nonetheless are unwilling to oust Nationalist China as part of the bargain.

Our view is that Red China should be kept out, as usual, and Nationalist China should be upheld. Red China's application for membership never has looked so shoddy. Nationalist China's credentials as a member never have looked so good.

THE PAR PURCHASE OF FHA AND VA MORTGAGES

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I deeply regret the administration's recent decision to defer the use of the $1 billion of special assistance funds the Congress voted for the par purchase of FHA and VA mortgages on low-priced homes. We all know that homebuilding has suffered a tremendous setback this year and that current commitments for the construction of new homes are down 50 percent or more in many, if not most, areas of our country. This disturbing setback will cause severe unemployment among the building trades' workers and should properly be of paramount concern to this or any administration. For these reasons, I think the decision, admittedly a budgetary one, of not spending this billion dollars, when it is so obviously much needed, is cutting expenditures at the wrong spot at the wrong time, and rather cold heartedly.

I fully realize that the administration has made other changes in Fannie Mae's operations which, over the long run, will assist the homebuilding industry. Increasing the price ceiling from $15,000 to $17,500 on existing homes, for example,

was a step in the right direction. Raising the price of new homes eligible for purchase to $25,000 also will be of valuable assistance. However, any builder can tell you that the timelag between announcing these changes and implementing these new regulations into new construction is very considerable. Thus while these moves will help in the future, it is much too far in the distance to be of help today. It is even more important that the $1 billion special assistance fund be made available immediately to at least help slow down unemployment.

BIG BROTHER

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the editor of the Sikeston Standard from Sikeston, Mo., is to be congratulated on an excellent editorial, entitled "Protection of Privacy," which appeared in the April 26, 1966, edition of his newspaper. The editorial summarizes many recent developments relating to invasions of privacy.

The editorial points out that although most Americans are "inured to living in the fishbowl age," there are limits. I urge my colleagues to read this well-written and comprehensive editorial and ask unanimous consent to insert the editorial at this point in the RECORD.

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

PROTECTION OF PRIVACY

Congress is looking for new ways to protect the privacy of the American citizen without creating more problems than it solves. The right to privacy is now—thanks to two Supreme Court decisions of the past year—backed by constitutional guarantees. Nevertheless actual encroachment on the privacy of the individual appears to be less escapable than ever.

The trouble is that, in the modern world, a large measure of privacy is necessarily sacrificed and the loss can be mitigated only slightly by new laws. Our society requires extensive record-keeping on every individual. This is a cradle-to-grave process that begin with footprinting the newborn infant and ends only with the cause-of-death notation on the death certificate.

Over a life span, the dossier piles up: data on parents, medical records, school reports, intelligence and psychological test scores, job histories, credit facts, and so on. Some of this information on the individual gives up himself, often through filling out the innumerable questionnaires that come his way. The remainder is obtained without his knowledge from sources not known to him.

The result is that more personal data on the average mid-20th century American be picked up by a routine check in a few days than scholars have been able to uncover about William Shakespeare—a well-known actor in his day—after four centuries of digging. And most Americans are so inured to living in the fishbowl age, they willingly disclose information about themselves which their forebears would have considered nobody's business but their own.

But there are limits, even for the privacy-stripped American of today. A few weeks ago, for instance, the State Department put a stop to the practice of asking U.S. embassies to keep watch on American travelers "considered controversial." In a highly publicized case of a different sort, the president of General Motors Corp. apologized on March 22 before a Senate subcommittee for hiring a detective agency to pry into the private life of a subcommittee witness. Ralph Nader had written a book and had given testimony critical of the industry for neglect of safety in automobiles design.

No less than a half-dozen congressional subcommittees have investigated some phase of the privacy invasion question over the past year or so. Some of their revelations led to corrective action. The Post Office Department closed down the peepholes through which its agents spied on employees in locker rooms and toilets. Of more general application, the Department curtailed a long-standing practice of placing mail covers—that is, recording information on the envelopes of letters delivered to particular addressees—for use by an investigative agency.

Another area where limits on privacy invasion are being sought involves the use of hidden eavesdropping devices. Practically everyone is agreed that private snooping through wiretapping or the secret placement of miniature microphones and transmitters should have no place in American life. The big argument is under what conditions the police should be allowed to use them in the war on crime.

Telephone tapping was presumably outlawed by Congress in 1934, yet the practice still goes on. Evidence gained from wiretapping is permitted in some state (though no federal) courts. The Justice Department has long sought legislation to permit law enforcers to tap phones in crime investigations. However, Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach told a Senate Subcommittee on March 22 it would be better for Congress to ban all wiretapping outright than to leave the situation in its present ambiguous state.

The new miniature eavesdropping devices present an even more difficult control problem. The Federal Communications Commission adopted a rule, effective on April 8, forbidding private citizens to use radio devices to eavesdrop, but left it up to the states to decide whether their police should use them. In New York State, a court held on March 1 that court orders permitting police eavesdropping by such a device were invalid because contrary to the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution governing search and seizure.

REPORT FROM VIETNAM BY NEIL SHEEHAN, OF THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Mr. Neil Sheehan, of the New York Times, has been reporting on Vietnam since 1962. I have read many perceptive reports from his pen during the past several years. His long experience in that country, together with his obvious impartiality, rationality, and superb style, makes his latest report on Vietnam, published in the New York Times Magazine of October 9, 1966, the best report on Vietnam that has come to my attention in recent months. I commend it to the attention of all Members of Congress and to the public, as well.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NOT A DOVE, BUT NO LONGER A HAWK

(By Neil Sheehan)

Americans, because they are Americans, arrive in Vietnam full of enthusiasm and with the best of intentions. After a prolonged period of residence, they leave with their enthusiasm a victim of the cynicism that pervades Vietnamese life and with their good intentions lost somewhere in a paddy field. I am no exception. When I first walked across the tarmac of Saigon's Tansonnhut Airport on a warm evening in April, 1962, nervous that the customs officers might not accept the journalist's visa I had hurriedly obtained from the South Vietnamese consulate in Hong Kong, I believed in what my country was doing in Vietnam. With military and economic aid and a few thousand pilots and Army advisers, the United States was attempting to help the non-Communists Vietnamese build a viable and independent nation-state and defeat a Communist guerrilla insurgency that would subject them to a dour tyranny. This seemed to me a worthy cause and something that needed to be done if other Southeast Asian peoples were to be allowed some freedom of choice in determining their course in history. Although I often disagreed with the implementation of American policy during my first two years in Vietnam, I was in accord with its basic aims.

I remember distinctly the thrill of climbing aboard a U.S. Army helicopter in the cool of the morning and taking off across the rice fields with a South Vietnamese battalion for a day's jousting with the Vietcong guerrillas. There was hope then that the non-Communist Vietnamese might win their war. I was proud of the young American pilots sitting at the controls in the cockpit and I was grateful for the opportunity to witness this adventure and to report it. We are fighting now, I used to think, and some day we will triumph and this will be a better country.

There were many disappointments those first two years, but when I left Vietnam in 1964, I was still, to use the current parlance, a hawk. I returned to Saigon in 1965 for another year. Now I have left again, and much has changed. There were 17,000 American servicemen in Vietnam at the time of my first departure and there are now 317,000 and I, while not a dove, am no longer a hawk.

If I had been wiser and could have foreseen the present consequences of that earlier and relatively small-scale American intervention in the affairs of this country, I doubt that I would have been enthusiastic during those first two years. I realize now, perhaps because this past year has impressed upon me more forcefully the realities of the war and of Vietnamese society, that I was naive in believing the non-Communist Vietnamese could defeat the Communist insurgency and build a decent and progressive social structure.

At a farewell dinner before my second departure from Saigon, the conversation drifted to the endlessly discussed but never resolved problem of gaining the sympathy of the peasantry. My host was a Vietnamese general, involuntarily retired through the vagaries of Saigon politics. To amuse us, he recounted an episode that had occurred in mid-1953 while he was commander of Franco-Vietnamese troops in the province of Buichu in what is now Communist North Vietnam.

That year, the Vietminh guerrillas, as the Vietcong were formerly called, accelerated their land-reform program. Communist cadres began confiscating the rice fields of landlords and dividing them up among the peasantry. To compete with the Vietminh and to arouse some popular support for the cause of his feeble Government and for France, the pro-French Emperor, Bao Dai, issued a decree reducing land rents from the traditional 40 to 50 per cent of the rice crop to 15 per cent.

Buichu was a predominantly Roman Catholic province. The two principal landlords there were the Catholic Bishop and the father of the Interior Minister in Bao Dai's Government. My host knew he would

have to gain the Bishop's cooperation if he was successfully to enforce the decree.

"Impossible," said the Bishop. "How can I feed 3,000 priests, nuns, seminarians and coolies on 15 per cent of the crop?"

"I agree, Your Excellency," said my host, "it will be difficult. But perhaps it is better to make sacrifices now while there is still time. If we don't do something to win the sympathy of the population, you may lose more than your rice. You may lose your Bishopric, your land and perhaps even your head."

"Impossible," said the Bishop. "I will write to the Interior Minister."

Three months later, for attempting to implement the decree despite the Bishop's opposition, my friend was removed on the initiative of the Interior Minister. By the following summer, the Vietminh were so strong in Buichu that the French decided to evacuate the province. The Bishop, his priests, nuns and seminarians fled to Hanoi and thence to South Vietnam when the Geneva accords shortly thereafter sealed France's defeat at Dienbienphu and divided Vietnam at the 17th Parallel.

Over the 13 years since 1953, the United States has supplanted France in Vietnam. Yet among the Vietnamese themselves, the two opposing sides have changed little.

Precolonial Vietnam was administered by mandarins drawn from the merchant and land-owning families. When France colonized the country in the 19th century, much of this native aristocracy became, in effect, colonial civil servants, intermediaries between their own people and the foreigner. During the First Indochina War these Vietnamese, with a stake in the traditional society which a French presence would preserve, cooperated with France. Now the same Vietnamese, for identical reasons, cooperate with the United States.

Air Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky, the current Premier of South Vietnam, was a French pilot. On occasional visits to the countryside he appears before the peasants in a trim black flight suit with a lavender scarf around his neck and a pearl-handled pistol at his waist—a kind of Asian Captain Marvel.

The Deputy Premier, Lieut. Gen. Nguyen Huu Co, and other generals in the Saigon military junta, were officers or sergeants in the French colonial forces. Their fondness for French cuisine, snappy uniforms and cocktail parties and receptions creates a pale but faithful reflection of the social round of colonial days. They are the Vietnamese who have inherited the worst of two cultures—the pretentiousness of the native mandarins and the rigidity of the French colonial officers and administrators. Premier Ky and the earlier successors of Bao Dai have also promulgated rent-reduction and land-reform laws at the urging of American advisers eager for social progress. All of these measures have been sabotaged because the regimes were and are composed of men who are members of, or who are allied with, mandarin families that held title to properties they have no intention of renouncing. While there are some patriotic and decent individuals among them, most of the men who rule Saigon have, like the Bourbons, learned nothing and forgotten nothing. They seek to retain what privileges they have and to regain those they have lost.

In Vietnam, only the Communists represent revolution and social change, for better or worse according to a man's politics. The Communist party is the one truly national organization that permeates both North and South Vietnam. The men who lead the party today, Ho Chi Minh and the other members of the Politburo in Hanoi, directed the struggle for independence from France and in the process captured much of the deeply felt nationalism of the Vietnamese people. Perhaps because of this, the Communists, despite their brutality and deceit, remain the only Vietnamese capable of rallying millions of their countrymen to sacrifice and hardship in the name of the nation and the only group not dependent on foreign bayonets for survival.

It is the tragedy of Vietnam that what began as a war of independence from France developed, as a result of its Communist leadership, into a civil conflict. Attempts to describe the current war as a geographically based struggle between North and South Vietnam breaks down almost immediately when it is recalled that Premier Ky and several other important members of his Government are North Vietnamese by birth, who fled south after the French defeat, while Pham Van Dong, the Premier of North Vietnam, was born in the South. The war is, rather, a struggle between different elements of the Vietnamese people as a whole.

The division of the country into two separate states at the 17th Parallel in 1954 was a provisional arrangement ending one scene in the drama. Vietnam's larger political realities extended then and still extend now in both directions across the demarcation line. North Vietnam controls and supports with men and matériel the Vietcong guerrilas in the South because the Vietcong leaders, although native Southerners, are members of the Vietnamese Communist party and obey orders from the Politburo in Hanoi.

In 1958 the late President Ngo Dinh Diem organized a Committee for the Liberation of North Vietnam, and since 1960 the Saigon Government, with American connivance and aid, has been smuggling saboteurs and commando teams into the North in a so-far vain effort to instigate a guerrilla movement among the Northern Catholics and mountain tribesmen. The opposing sides, in short, have never recognized the 17th Parallel as a permanent boundary and have violated the frontier whenever it suited them.

Communist leadership of the anti-colonial movement led to the involvement of Vietnam in the larger context of the cold war and brought the intervention of the United States, first to aid the French and then to develop and support a non-Communist administration an army in the South. For its own strategic and political ends, the United States is thus protecting a non-Communist Vietnamese social structure that cannot defend itself and that perhaps does not deserve to be defended. Our responsibility for prolonging what is essentially a civil conflict may be one of the major reasons for the considerable amount of confusion, guilt and soul-searching among Americans over the Vietnam war.

I know this is true in my own case and in the case of many Americans of my acquaintance who have lived for long periods in Vietnam. We are continually chagrined to discover that idealism and dedication are largely the prerogative of the enemy. The American soldier makes the lack of aggressiveness of the Government forces the butt of unending gibes. He grows to hate "Charlie," the G.I. slang name for the Vietcong guerrilla and the North Vietnamese regular, because "Charlie" kills his friends, but he soon learns to respect Communist bravery and cunning.

An American general recently paid a strange tribute to a Vietcong guerrilla who held up an entire U.S. Army infantry company for an hour in the jungle north of Saigon. The guerrilla was the lone survivor of several Communists defending a bunker. He fired off all his own ammunition and that of his dead comrades, and hurled back at the Americans the grenades they tossed into the bunker. He was finally killed while throwing rocks in a last gesture of defiance. "If one of our men had fought like that," the general said, "he would have been awarded the Medal of Honor."

Since the beginning of last year, Hanoi has increased the size of its regular army contingent in the South to a total of about 47,000 men. In the face of sustained bombing of the road and rail system in the North and the Ho Chi Minh Trail through Laos, the Communists continue to infiltrate men at an estimated rate of 4,500 to 5,000 a month. Many of these young men are conscripts who march south because of pressure on themselves and their families. Yet, once in the South, they fight well, and desertions are few despite the hardships and the severe losses through disease and battle. The Vietcong guerrillas have also managed steadily to expand their forces through recruitment and conscription.

The Saigon regime, on the other hand, has experienced great difficulty in increasing the strength of its armed forces because of a very high desertion rate. Desertions are greatest among conscripts, an indication that the average South Vietnamese feels little or no commitment to defend his own society. About 85 percent of Saigon's armed forces are, consequently, volunteers who take up arms for pay. This gives the Government forces a distinctly mercenary cast that affects both their attitude toward the population and, except for a few elite units, their performance in combat.

From the contrast in behavior of the two sides, I can only conclude that Vietnamese will die more willingly for a regime which, though Communist, is at least genuinely Vietnamese and offers them some hope of improving their lives, than for one which is committed to the galling status quo and is the creation of Washington. The official assertion that the Communist soldier endures the appalling conditions of his daily life and behaves so commendably in combat out of terror of his superiors becomes patently ridiculous to anyone who has witnessed a battle. Terror may drive a man to march toward the enemy's guns, but it will not make him fight valiantly. The course of the conflict has made apparent that the Communists are able to arouse and to exploit the native Vietnamese qualities of hardihood and resilience, and to convince large numbers of their people that the cause of their Government is just.

Most non-Communist Vietnamese are incapable, because of the values of the society in which they live, of looking beyond individual and family interests. Their overwhelming concern with "me and my relatives" deprives the society of a social consciousness Americans take for granted in their own culture and fosters the corruption and nepotism that exist throughout the administration. The disease of corruption appears to be worsening in direct proportion to the burgeoning amounts of American aid flowing into the country. Stories of embezzlement are legion and repeatedly embitter Americans.

Province and district chiefs' positions are frequently sold to the highest bidders by those responsible for making the appointments. The incumbent is then expected both to recoup the cost of his job from corruption and to make payoffs to the higher officials who sold it to him. Some American officials with long experience in Vietnam estimate that about 20 per cent of United States aid supplied for counter-insurgency projects in the countryside finds its way to the Vietcong and that another 30 to 40 per cent is diverted by Government officials. Cement, roofing, steel bars and other building materials destined for schools and refugee housing mysteriously end up on the open market or in private villas and apartment buildings. "What gets down to the poor — of a —— in the paddy field," one official said, "is a trickle." A U.S. Army Special Forces captain one told me how he had arranged for rice to be flown in American planes to a camp of

several thousands refugees in a remote area who were suffering from malnutrition. The local district chief confiscated the rice and sold it to the refugees at exorbitant prices.

While Americans worry about winning the war and creating an effective Vietnamese Government that can gain the support of its people, the mandarin families that run the regime have a different set of priorities. In one important province on the central coast this spring a rare honest and effective Vietnamese official, who was a favorite of the Americans, was fired because he began to talk about corruption by the two senior military commanders in the region. He was replaced by a cousin of one of the generals.

Numerous complaints from the American Embassy led Premier Ky to warn his fellow generals at one meeting of the junta that they were embezzling too much and should exercise some restraint. Their reply was that they had to think of their families. Vows by the Premier that corrupt officials will be shot have brought periodic headlines in the Saigon newspapers and the execution of one Chinese businessman and a half-dozen common hoodlums. Ordinary Vietnamese assume that Premier Ky has found it imprudent to arrange firing squads for some of his colleagues on the junta. One general's wife is sometimes referred to as "Queen of the Payoff."

Promises of land reform are solemnly reported in the American press and are apparently taken with some seriousness in official circles in Washington. I have often wondered why, since the promises are never carried out and the speeches made today are practically identical in content and phrasing to those made four years ago by some other Government leader. To gain their own ends, Asians frequently tell Americans what they think Americans want to hear. The Vietnamese, possibly because of their greater experience with Americans, seem to have developed a particular talent for this. Last April, during one of his more candid moments, Premier Ky told a group of correspondents: "Never believe what any Vietnamese tells you, including me."

In February, amid the hoopla following the Honolulu conference that was to lead to an intensive program of social, political and economic reform, the junta organized a "Social Revolution Day" in Saigon. Two thousand civil servants, soldiers, students and religious leaders were assembled on the lawn of the former presidential palace in the center of the city. The social reformers arrived in their Mercedes-Benz sedans and, dressed in well-tailored suits or bemedaled uniforms, began to read the usual speeches. The scene had a disturbing atmosphere of déjà vu. Within 10 minutes, a segment of the crowd, less polite than the rest, began walking out in boredom. The police, having apparently anticipated what would happen, had locked the gates of the palace grounds. No one was allowed to leave until the speeches had ended, despite a good deal of shouting and arguing back and forth through the steel bars.

The current social system discriminates against the poor and prevents social mobility. The mandarin families resist all efforts to change it, since it works in their favor. Although the United States has spent millions of dollars building primary schools in Vietnam, for example, it has been unable to bring about any fundamental reform of the Vietnamese educational structure, which makes certain that the sons of the prosperous, and almost no one else, will achieve the secondary education necessary to social advancement—whether in the army, the civil service or the professions.

Sending a peasant boy to primary school and then making it virtually impossible for him to achieve a decent secondary-school education fosters discontent, rather than lessening it. There is considerable evidence that many young Vietnamese of peasant origin joint the Vietcong because the Communists, who have been forced by the nature of their revolution to develop leadership from the countryside, offer them their best hope of avoiding a life on the rung of the ladder where they began—at the bottom.

A friend of mine once visited a hamlet with a South Vietnamese Army major who is one of the few field grade officers to defeat the system by rising from a humble beginning. The major spoke to the farmers in peasant dialect instead of in the sophisticated urban Vietnamese most Goverment officials use.

"You're not a major," said one farmer in astonishment.

"Yes, I am," said the major.

"No, you're not," said the farmer. "You talk like a peasant and no peasant could become a major."

A drive through Saigon demonstrates another fashion in which the social system works. Virtually all the new construction consists of luxury apartments, hotels and office buildings financed by Chinese businessmen or affluent Vietnamese with relatives or connections within the regime. The buildings are destined to be rented to Americans. Saigon's workers live, as they always have, in fetid slums on the city's outskirts.

Since 1954, the United States has poured more than $3.2-billion of economic aid into South Vietnam, but no Saigon regime has ever undertaken a low-cost housing project of any size. The Singapore Government, in contrast, is erecting thousands of low-cost housing units for its people.

While Vietnamese with influence prosper in the cities and towns, the war has created a different world in the countryside. It is a world in which the masses of the peasantry no longer live—they endure.

Each afternoon, in the air-conditioned press-briefing room in Saigon, the United States Military Command releases a communiqué reporting that 300 or more "enemy structures" have been destroyed by American fighter-bombers or by the guns of Seventh Fleet warships that day. The statistics imply sound military progress until a visit to the countryside reveals that what is meant by an "enemy structure" is usually a peasant hut in a hamlet the Communists control, or which the American and South Vietnamese authorities suspect the Communists control.

No comprehensive statistics on civilian casualties are available. The nature of the war would make the assembling of such statistics very difficult, but the military authorities have also never seriously attempted to gather them.

An indication of what civilian casualties may be, however, is given by the fact that American and other foreign medical teams working in three-quarters of the country's 43 provinces treat 2,000 civilian war-wounded each month. If one accepts the normal military ratio of one dead for two wounded, the monthly figure is 1,000 civilian dead.

The number of wounded handled by the medical teams, I believe from my own observation, is merely a fraction of the total. The medical teams treat only those wounded who reach the hospitals in provincial capitals. There are undoubtedly many more who never get that far. These victims are helped at Government district headquarters or milita outposts, or by Vietcong field hospitals and dispensaries—or they simply survive, or die, without treatment. Most of the wounds I have seen in the provincial hospitals are the type a victim could survive for two or three days without medical attention. Wounds that require rapid treatment are not usually in evidence, presumably because the victims die before they can obtain hospitalization.

Although civilians are being killed and wounded by both sides, my own investigations have indicated that the majority of civilians casualties result from American and South Vietnamese airstrikes and artillery and naval gunfire. Last November, I found one fishing village in Quangngai province, on the central coast north of Saigon, in which at least 180 persons—and possibly 600—had been killed during the previous two months by aircraft and Seventh Fleet destroyers. The five hamlets that composed the village, once a prosperous community of 15,000 people, had been reduced to rubble.

The gun and the knife of the Vietcong assassin are, in contrast, far more selective than cannon and fragmentation bombs; the victims are usually limited to Government officials and sympathizers. It has been estimated that, over the past decade, about 20,000 persons have been assassinated by Communist terrorists. This is a gruesome total, but the annual average is a great deal lower than the probable yearly number of ordinary civilian victims of the war.

Lack of sufficient American troops to occupy and hold ground when it has been wrested from the Communists is one of the major reasons for the extent of damage to civilian life and property. Once a battle has ended, the American and South Vietnamese troops withdraw. The theoretical follow-up by South Vietnamese territorial forces, police and administrators to pacify the region does not materialize except in a very limited number of instances, and the Vietcong guerrillas and their North Vietnamese allies move in again. The Americans eventually return and the same region is thus fought over repeatedly.

It would be easy to blame the American military authorities for the destruction, but this would not be fair. The Vietcong and the North Vietnamese regulars habitually fortify hamlets with elaborate trenchwork and bunker systems. Infantry attacking in classic style across open paddy fields would suffer prohibitive casualties. Under these circumstances, military commanders can only be expected to use whatever force is at their disposal.

Gen. William C. Westmoreland, the United States military commander in Vietnam, has ordered that all possible care be taken to avoid killing and wounding the innocent and that, whenever feasible, civilians be warned to leave their hamlets prior to airstrikes and artillery bombardments. Unfortunately, General Westmoreland's order has sometimes been ignored by subordinate commanders.

Hamlets are also habitually bombed and shelled at the request of a South Vietnamese province or district chief who has been told by some paid informer that Communist troops are present there. Information from informers is notoriously unreliable, the peasants are often not responsible for the presence of the Communists and, since ground units do not exploit the bombings and shellings, these attacks seem to have negligible military value. American officials excuse the practice by claiming that the Vietnamese, as the legal authorities, have the right to destroy their own hamlets, even if Americans perform the destructive acts—a fine bit of legalism that ignores the basic moral issue. I have occasionally thought that the practice results largely from the cynicism of South Vietnamese officialdom and a superfluity of aircraft and artillery.

The extraordinary firepower of American weaponry, whose ferocity must be witnessed to be comprehended, is another contributing factor to widespread civilian suffering. On an average day, U.S. warplanes alone loose 175 to 200 tons of explosives on the South Vietnamese countryside. Then there are the thousands of artillery and naval shells and the hundreds of thousands of rounds of mortar and small-arms ammunition. The cratered landscape seen from an airplane window is an excellent advertisement for the ingenuity of American munitions makers.

The flow of refugees from the countryside is the most eloquent evidence available of the gradual destruction of rural society under the impact of the war. The number of refugees has now passed the million mark. It takes a great deal to make a Vietnamese peasant forsake his land and the graves of his ancestors.

Most refugees I have questioned told me that the Vietcong taxed them and made them work harder than usual, but that they could live with the Communists. They left their homes, they said, because they could no longer bear American and South Vietnamese bombs and shells.

If resettled properly, the refugees could conceivably develop into an asset for the Saigon Government. Yet, true to its usual behavior, the regime neglects them and the majority are left to shift for themselves. Refugee slums have risen in the cities almost as fast as G.I. bars.

Deserted hamlets and barren rice fields, now a common sight, are other evidence of what the war is doing to rural South Vietnam. In several provinces on the northern central coast as much as one-third of the rice land has been forsaken. The American policy of killing crops in Communist-held areas by spraying them with chemical defoliants from aircraft is hastening this process. During the first six months of this year 59,000 acres were destroyed.

The corrosive effect on the country of the American presence is not confined to military operations. Economically and culturally, the advent of the Americans has introduced maladies only time can cure. One is inflation. The primitive economy, already seriously disrupted by the war, has now been swamped by the purchasing power of tens of millions of dollars being dispensed for the construction of bases, airfields and port facilities and by the free spending of the individual American soldier.

This year the United States will pump a minimum of $140-million into the Vietnamese economy to cover the locally generated costs of the construction of new bases and the maintenance of existing ones. This sum constitutes about one-seventh of the country's entire money supply. American troops are themselves currently spending another $7-million a month.

The moral degeneration caused by the G.I. culture that has mushroomed in the cities and towns is another malady. Bars and bordellos, thousands of young Vietnamese women degrading themselves as bar girls and prostitutes, gangs of hoodlums and beggars and children selling their older sisters and picking pockets have become ubiquitous features of urban life. I have sometimes thought, when a street urchin with sores covering his legs, stopped me and begged for a few cents' worth of Vietnamese piastres, that he might be better off growing up as a political commissar. He would then, at least, have some self-respect.

Rarely in any war has the name of the people been evoked more by both sides than in the Vietnam conflict. Yet the Vietnamese peasantry, who serve as cannon fodder for Communists and non-Communists, remain curiously mute—a hushed Greek chorus to their own tragedy.

The conditions of life in Vietnam will probably always make an accurate assessment of the peasants' attitudes toward the war impossible to obtain. I have received the impression, however, on visits to accessible hamlets, that many of the peasants are so weary of the fighting they would accept any settlement that brought them peace.

Last March, I spent two days in one hamlet south of the port of Danang on the central coast. A company of U.S. Marines had seized the hamlet from the Vietcong six months previously, and a Government pacification team, protected by the Marines, was working there. In three years, the hamlet had changed hands three times. There were almost no young men in the community. Roughly half of the families had sons, brothers or husbands in the Communist ranks. The remaining families were about equally divided between those with neutral attitudes and those who were Government sympathizers.

The morning after I arrived, the peasants, under the supervision of the Government pacification workers, began constructing a fence around the hamlet perimeter to keep out Vietcong infiltrators. Through an interpreter, I asked two farmers among a group of old men, women and children digging postholes if they thought the fence would be of any use.

"Maybe it will," one said, "but I don't think so. A fence won't keep out the Vietcong."

"What did the Vietcong make you do when they controlled the hamlet?" I asked.

"They made us pull down the fence we had put up before, and dig trenches and lay booby traps," the second farmer said.

"Well, if you don't think the fence will do any good," I asked, "why are you putting it up?"

"We are just plain farmers," the first peasant said, glancing apprehensively at a policeman a few feet away with a carbine slung across his arm. "We have to obey any Government here."

As he spoke, a Vietcong sniper, hidden in a patch of sugar cane beyond the paddy fields, fired two shots. The old men, women and children scurried for cover, their fear and lack of enthusiasm for fence-building evident on their faces.

During a tour of South Vietnam in 1963, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, referred to the conflict as a "dirty little war." While the Vietnam conflict may be even dirtier now than it was in 1963, it can no longer be termed little.

Reliable statistics are very elusive in Vietnam, but I would estimate that at least 250,000 persons have been killed since the war began in 1957. Last year, according to official figures, 34,585 Communists were killed and the Saigon Government forces suffered 11,200 deaths. Through mid-September of this year, again according to official statistics, 37,299 Vietcong and North Vietnamese regulars have died in battle and 7,017 Government troops have been killed.

American losses remained at a relatively low level until 1965, when the Johnson Administration committed ground combat units and began to create an expeditionary corps. That year, 1,369 American servicemen died in North and South Vietnam and neighboring Laos, and 6,114 were wounded. This year, as American offensive operations have picked up stride with the strengthening of the logistical apparatus, casualties have soared to 3,524 killed and 21,107 wounded, through mid-September. American dead are now averaging nearly a hundred a week and can be expected to increase as the expeditionary corps grows and more Americans are exposed to hostile fire.

The attitudes of the leadership in Hanoi and Washington indicate that the contest is far from being resolved. The rate at which North Vietnam is infiltrating its regular troops into the South and the willingness of the United States to engage its own ground forces and to escalate the air war against the North portend several more years of serious bloodshed. The world may hope for peace, but neither side has yet hurt the other sufficiently to prevent it from continuing. Both sides are trapped in a dilemma created by their history and political and strategic considerations. Washington cannot withdraw its troops from South Vietnam, as Hanoi demands, without making certain an eventual Communist seizure of power there and negating all the efforts of the last decade to maintain a friendly Government in Saigon.

Hanoi's best chance of winning now lies in prolonging the bloodletting to the point where the American public will tire of a war for a small land whose name most Americans cannot even pronounce correctly (they tend to say "Veetnam"). If the North de-escalates the fighting it will remove the principal source of political pressure on the Johnson Administration—the number of coffins being flown home from Saigon. Without the killing, the United States might be able to occupy South Vietnam indefinitely. The fact that 60,000 U.S. troops are stationed in South Korea brings no demonstrators into the streets and arouses no anxiety among American mothers, because the shooting in Korea has stopped.

A year ago, I worried that the patience of the American people would run out, that Ho Chi Minh would have his way and that the United States would lose the Vietnam war. This fear no longer troubles me nearly as much. I have the feeling that somehow we can muddle through this grim business. We may not win in Vietnam as we won in World War II, yet we may well prevail. Given our overwhelming military superiority, it is entirely possible that Washington, over a period of years, may be able to destroy the Vietcong and North Vietnamese main-force units in the South, and to transform what is currently a militarily sound but politically weak position into one of some, if doubtful, political strength.

Rather, my quiet worry concerns what we are doing to ourselves in the course of prosecuting and possibly some day winning this war. In World War II and in Korea the aggression of one state against another was an established fact. The United States acted with clear moral justification and Americans fought as they always like to think they fight—for human freedom and dignity. In Vietnam this moral superiority has given way to the amorality of great power politics, specifically, to the problem of maintaining the United States as the paramount power in Southeast Asia. The Vietnamese people have become mere pawns in the struggle. Whatever desires they might possess have become incidental. The United States can no longer make any pretense of fighting to safeguard South Vietnam's independence. The presence of 317,000 American troops in the country has made a mockery of its sovereignty and the military junta in Saigon would not last a week without American bayonets to protect it.

Precisely because the Saigon Government represents nothing beyond its administration and army, the United States has had to fall back on its own military force to maintain its position and to win the war. Washington can dispense the latest in weaponry, but the First Air Cavalry Division and the Third Marine Amphibious Force cannot inspire the loyalty of the Vietnamese peasantry, and General Motors cannot manufacture decent non-Communist Vietnamese leadership, effective government and dedication. Only Vietnamese can supply these and the non-Communist Vietnamese have proven themselves incapable of providing them.

Thus, in the final analysis, American strategy in Vietnam consists of creating a killing machine in the form of a highly equipped expeditionary corps and then turning this machine on the enemy in the hope that over the years enough killing will be done to force the enemy's collapse through exhaustion and despair. This strategy, although possibly the only feasible alternative open to a modern industrial power in such a situation, is of necessity brutal and heedless of many of its victims.

Despite these misgivings, I do not see how we can do anything but continue to prosecute the war. We can and should limit the violence and the suffering being inflicted on the civilians as much as possible, but, for whatever reasons, successive Administrations

in Washington have carried the commitment in Vietnam to the point where it would be very difficult to prevent any precipitate retreat from degenerating into a rout. If the United States were to disengage from Vietnam under adverse conditions, I believe that the resulting political and psychological shockwaves might undermine our entire position in Southeast Asia. We shall, I am afraid, have to put up with our Vietnamese mandarin allies. We shall not be able to reform them and it is unlikely that we shall be able to find any other Vietnamese willing to cooperate with us. We shall have to continue to rely mainly on our military power, accept the odium attached to its use and hope that someday this power will bring us to a favorable settlement.

But I simply cannot help worrying that, in the process of waging this war, we are corrupting ourselves. I wonder, when I look at the bombed-out peasant hamlets, the orphans begging and stealing on the streets of Saigon and the women and children with napalm burns lying on the hospital cots, whether the United States or any nation has the right to inflict this suffering and degradation on another people for its own ends. And I hope we will not, in the name of some anti-Communist crusade, do this again.

PEACEFUL ENGAGEMENT OUR OBJECTIVE IN EUROPE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, last week President Johnson, in addressing the National Conference of Editorial Writers, said that our objective in Europe is to end what he called the bitter legacy of World War II and move on from the narrow concept of peacful coexistence to the broader vision of peaceful engagement. The speech was a remarkable one for the reality which it recognized. In an editorial yesterday, the Washington Evening Star commented upon this laudable address. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

HIS GOAL—PEACEFUL ENGAGEMENT

President Johnson's discussion last week of his objectives in Europe deserves high marks on at least three counts—its awareness of the realities, its sensible character and a tone that was hopeful despite an obvious recognition of the difficulties which lie ahead.

The address to the National Conference of Editorial Writers did not concern itself with Viet Nam, nor was it designed to do so. In fact, the President mentioned that war only once—when he said that we do not intend to let our differences with the Soviet Union on Viet Nam prevent us from exploring all opportunities for improving the political climate in Europe. If there is new hope with respect to the Vietnamese war, it will be found elsewhere—in such things as the recent interesting undertakings and cryptic comments of Indonesia's Adam Malik.

Of Europe, the President said: "We know the world is changing. Our policy must reflect the reality of today—not yesterday." Our objective, he went on to say, "is to end the bitter legacy of World War II"—to move on "from the narrow concept of peaceful coexistence to the broader vision of peaceful engagement."

The details, the initial steps, which the President believes are necessary to the attainment of his goal were spelled out in the address, and need not be repeated here, though perhaps one should be mentioned. This has to do with the strengthening, the unifying, of a Western Europe which includes the France of Charles de Gaulle as an essential pre-condition to achieving that balance of power which is needed to bridge the gulf that still divides East and West. But the President probably had De Gaulle in mind when he said that "in every part of the world, new forces are at the gates: New countries, new aspirations, new men. In this spirit, let us look ahead to the tasks that confront the Atlantic nations." In short, France will not always be the France of Charles de Gaulle; new men soon will be knocking at the gates of Paris.

The President is laboring under no illusion. "The building of true peace and reconciliation in Europe," he said, "will be a long process." Still, one may believe that this address marked a long step in that direction. Not so much, perhaps, because of any special devotion anywhere to peace merely for the sake of peace. But rather because peace and the material progress which would attend it, as long as national security is not threatened, serve the interests of all concerned. It has long been our view that the men who will make the choice between war and peace in Europe are rational men—and that rational men in the end will support that which is beneficial rather than ruinous to themselves and their countries.

TAX STATUS OF EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES OF TEACHERS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, many of us in Congress have been deeply concerned for many years over the inconsistencies in determining the tax status of educational expenses incurred by teachers.

The regulations proposed by the Treasury Department earlier this year appeared to me to represent a very restrictive interpretation of the law, and I am very happy that this ruling has been reconsidered.

Although the revised rules are more liberal, I hope the Senate will still consider legislation pending in the Finance Committee. The bill, of which I am a cosponsor, would provide a uniform method by which teachers could claim deductions for their educational expenses.

The passage of this legislation would give statutory affirmation to the principle that the cost to teachers of improving their skills and expanding their knowledge is a necessary business expense and, as such, should be deductible. In addition, the terms of the bill are broader and more specific than those of the proposed new Treasury regulations.

Teachers are called upon to perform one of the most important functions in our society, and we should do everything possible to assist them. I hope, particularly, that Congress and the other branches of the Federal Government will finally take positive action to encourage our teachers to continue their own formal education.

THE INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMITTEE

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the recent issue of Inco magazine carried a very informative article written by the Honorable A. D. P. Heeney, Q.C., describing the important work performed by the International Joint Commission. Mr. Heeney is the Chairman of the Canadian section of the Commission. This agency, which was established by the United States and Canada in 1909, for nearly 60 years has been playing a very significant role in helping to minimize and settle any disputes which may arise with our friendly neighbor to the north.

As the author points out, the Commissioners do not serve as protagonists trying to win a contest for their own country, but rather seek "solutions to common problems in the common interest." Testimony to this harmonious, constructive approach to international relations is the fact that in only 3 of the more than 80 cases which have been before the Commission have the members divided on national grounds or been unable to agree on a settlement.

It is especially pleasing for me to call attention to the fact that since January 7 of this year the Honorable Matthew E. Welsh, former Governor of the State of Indiana, has been the Chairman of the U.S. section of the International Joint Commission.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

DIPLOMACY WITH A DIFFERENCE: THE INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION

(By A. D. P. Heeney, Q.C., Chairman, Canadian Section, International Joint Commission)

To the great majority of Canadians and Americans whose daily associations are almost uniformly friendly and effortless, it is ironic and puzzling that there should be problems and differences between their countries. Yet the reason is plain enough, for it is rooted in the history and economics of neighborhood. It persists as a condition of our continental cohabitation because Canada, no less than the United States, is determined to remain in charge of its own affairs despite the great disparity in their power and influence in the world. And, as each country develops and prospers, their involvement with one another at every level continues to multiply. So, inevitably, do the occasions for disagreement and friction.

Questions arising between Canada and the United States are normally dealt with by the conventional diplomatic means—negotiations between governments. But in one area—"along the common frontier"—the two countries employ quite other methods for settling their differences, and have done so for more than half a century. Such matters are dealt with by the most venerable of Canada-United States institutions, which enjoys the somewhat grandiose title of "International Joint Commission."

A SUCCESSFUL EXPERIMENT

Amid predictions that it would be a short-lived experiment, the International Joint Commission was created by the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909. "Not so!" commented Elihu Root, when supporting in the Senate the Treaty he had earlier signed as Secretary of State, "I do not anticipate that the time will ever come when this Commission will not be needed. I think that as the two countries along this tremendous boundary become more and more thickly settled the need for it will increase . . ." Despite a shaky beginning and several threats of premature demise, the record of the Commission during the past fifty-odd years has vindicated the predictions

of its sponsors. Nowadays it is commonplace for orators in both countries to point with pride to the unique and constructive role of the IJC in the complex course of Canadian-American relations.

The unique features of the International Joint Commission are its composition and its method of operation; its chief virtue is its flexibility, its capacity to adjust to change. It was the conviction of the negotiators of the 1909 Treaty that solutions to "boundary" problems should be sought not in the normal bilateral negotiations of diplomacy but in the deliberations of a permanent tribunal composed equally of Canadians and Americans. To this principle the Treaty gave its sanction; to it the Commission has sought to adhere ever since. The Commissioners act, not as delegates striving for national advantage under instruction from their respective governments, but as members of a single body seeking solutions to common problems in the common interest. The approach is not dissimilar to that of a court of law composed of a number of judges. The conclusions are the Commission's, though they embrace the individual opinions of the several Commissioners. They are arrived at after a process of weighing the evidence, though the procedure of the Commission is characterized by a flexibility unknown to the rules of legal evidence. The decisions are made after due, and joint, deliberation.

The search for the common interest as a basis for settlement has been a cardinal feature not only of the IJC's proceedings but also of the work of the joint technical boards created by the Commission in its own image to assist in its investigations. The IJC's first U.S. Chairman, James A. Tawney, expressed the idea this way: "We are neither Canadians nor Americans but we are each and all representatives of all the people on both sides . . ." This attitude has enabled the Commission to reach harmonious conclusions in virtually every case that has come before it. Only in those rare instances where this posture has not been wholly sustained have satisfactory solutions proved elusive.

NEW MODEL DIPLOMACY

Although formal negotiation of the Boundary Waters Treaty was conducted through London and the British Embassy in Washington, the real father of the Treaty was a lawyer from Ontario, George Gibbons. As Canadian Chairman of an *ad hoc* waterways commission set up by Canada and the United States in 1903, he became convinced that effective development of water resources intersected by the international boundary would be severely hampered unless there were prior agreement on the principles which should govern their use and unless some "permanent" body were set up with authority to apply them. The alternatives—special *ad hoc* commissions or diplomatic negotiations (through London) for each case—were equally objectionable, for experience had amply shown that both of these methods entailed long and repeated wrangling.

What was needed, Gibbons concluded, was a mode of direct contact between Ottawa and Washington through a jointly constituted body which would be permanent, above local prejudice and governed by agreed principles. Indeed, Gibbons thought, such a forum might well prove capable of dealing not only with water problems but also with other matters at issue between the two countries. "Once the Americans come to deal directly with us," he wrote, "they will play the game fairly. It is only because we have got John Bull along that they bully us. Once get him out of the game and there will be no prestige in tackling a little fellow who will kick their shins."

Sent to Washington in 1907 to explore the possibilities, Gibbons at first found Secretary of State Root unenthusiastic. To confer such powers upon any international body involved issues "too grave for the Governments to renounce control over." The "little grey terrier" persisted tenaciously in his views and soon found a strong ally in Washington. Chandler Anderson, a special adviser to the Secretary of State, was in basic sympathy with the project and, with his support, Root was finally won over.

The governments collaborated to draft the Boundary Waters Treaty which was signed on January 11, 1909. By 1912 the IJC was in business with a full complement of Commissioners. Alas, Gibbons was not among them. Following the Canadian election of 1911, he had been banished to the political wilderness with his patron, Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

A PHILOSOPHY IN ACTION

Gibbons had gone, but his ideas had been embodied in the Treaty and his philosophy was to guide the IJC in action. The Treaty had provided that the Commission was to act as a unit in all matters coming before it. Decisions were to be made by a majority of the Commissioners, irrespective of their nationality. Though allowance was made for separate reports to each government, the authors of the Treaty believed—and the governments intended—that resort to this provision would be infrequent and that the Commission would normally be able to function in unison to achieve equitable solutions in the common interest of both countries.

Over the years there has been striking evidence of the Commissioners' attachment to this basic philosophy of impartiality and disinterest. In only three of the eighty-odd cases with which the Commission has dealt have the Commissioners divided on national lines or failed to reach agreement. There is good reason to believe, however, that, on at least one of these occasions, failure to agree was the result of the adoption by Commissioners, public and in advance, of positions conceived to be those of their respective governments. Consequently, when they sat down to deliberate upon the issues, the Commissioners found themselves negotiators rather than impartial investigators and the Commission machinery broke down. There seems little reason to anticipate a repetition of such experience.

THE JOINT APPROACH

The cases which have come before the Commission so far have all arisen along the boundary. In one instance the problem was one of air pollution and it seems likely there will be more of such references as industrial plants burgeon in border areas. But to date the great bulk of IJC business has been concerned with the use of our great common water resources, from Passamaquoddy Bay to the Pacific. It has involved questions of domestic and sanitary supply, navigation, power development, irrigation and pollution. It has varied in nature and extent from the extraction of maximum benefit from small prairie streams to multi-million dollar developments on our great rivers. Most of these cases have come before the Commission as agreed "references" from the two governments. After investigations and public hearings, the conclusions and recommendations have gone forward to Washington and Ottawa. In others, the IJC has exercised its "judicial" authority under the Treaty and ruled upon proposals for the construction of works which affect natural water levels and flows.

To conduct its investigations for technical advice, the Commission requires substantial assistance from experts. Because it is authorized by the governments in each case to call upon the best-qualified experts in the public services of the two countries, the IJC is able to meet the personnel requirements while keeping its permanent staff to a modest minimum. The Commission has taken full advantage of this authority and, in so doing, has developed a novel and effective mechanism and procedure for assembling and coordinating the information and advice it requires. It selects the experts suited to its purposes and assembles them into "international boards," Americans and Canadians acting as one body under joint chairmen. At present there are twenty-six of these boards at work, some engaged in investigatory work preliminary to Commission reports, others in a supervisory role in situations already the subject of Commission action.

On the whole this system of joint international boards has proved an effective means of mobilizing the variety of talent and experience required for the Commission's business. Certainly this technique has proved a valuable incentive to the closer coordination of federal departmental operations in both countries while, particularly in water pollution cases, it has greatly facilitated cooperation with responsible state and provincial authorities.

WATER POLLUTION AND LAKE LEVELS

There are some twenty cases of various kinds and at various stages currently before the Commission. Of course, the most important in terms of their scale and potential consequences—economic, social and political—have to do with the Great Lakes Basin. Here the most urgent problem is water pollution, about which there is increasing anxiety among both Americans and Canadians. Equally large in scope is the study launched by the IJC over a year ago into water levels throughout the Basin.

Reports of the increasing pollution of North America's water resources and the fearful prospect of critical shortages of clean water in some regions have given rise to public anxiety in both Canada and the United States. Pollution is no respecter of political division and the consequences of pollution in lakes and rivers which straddle the border may affect health and property on both sides of the line. The thousands of miles of water frontier between the two countries, the scores of rivers and streams which flow across the border—all in some degree open to misuse—are, in this context, potential sources of friction and dispute. Here the Commission has no direct jurisdiction. But Article IV of the Treaty does prohibit the pollution of boundary and trans-boundary waters on either side of the border "to the injury of health or property on the other side." It is under this provision that the IJC has been drawn increasingly into the gathering battle against water pollution. This seems altogether likely to become its principal preoccupation.

The Commission was first engaged in a study of water pollution as long ago as 1918 when it found the situation in parts of the Great Lakes "generally chaotic, everywhere perilous and in some cases disgraceful." But even such forceful language failed to produce any positive results and the Commission's warning of things to come was ignored.

It was not until after the Second World War that the governments took up the problem again. Since 1946, there have been six Commission references and investigations on aspects of pollution involving principally the "Connecting Channels" of the Great Lakes, the St. Croix River, the Rainy River-Lake of of the Woods area and, in 1964, the Red River (of the North) and the Great Lakes themselves. In most cases where the IJC has completed its investigations and submitted recommendations to governments, the results have been constructive and the situation has been improved. Local authorities have in several instances accepted the Commission's "objectives for water quality" and taken action accordingly. In other cases progress has been disappointingly slow.

The real test of the will of Canadian and United States authorities to enforce the prohibition of Article IV, and, perhaps, of the

effectiveness of the IJC machinery and method in combating pollution in boundary waters will be in the vast Great Lakes investigation now going forward. Included in the study are Lake Erie, Lake Ontario and the international section of the St. Lawrence. It is probably the most extensive and most complex investigation of its kind ever undertaken. Not only does it involve immense bodies of water but it includes problems not dealt with in previous studies—for example, the effects of the massive introduction of nutrients, the baffling phenomenon of eutrophication.

The Great Lakes investigation is as urgent as it is complex. Not long after it was initiated, it became evident to the Commissioners that the condition of these waters, particularly Lake Erie, was bad and growing worse. Accordingly, in an interim report submitted to governments at the end of last year, the Commission emphasized the need for emergency measures to slow down the process of deterioration and to press on with the research required to understand the problem better and to devise solutions. There are signs that state and provincial governments as well as the federal authorities appreciate the gravity of the situation. The Commission's program is now going forward satisfactorily through the coordinated efforts of officials on both sides of the line.

In the war on pollution, it is the local authorities that have the primary responsibility and the principal weapons of enforcement. This is not to say that the federal governments are without responsibility or recourse. The problem has become national, as well as international, in scope, and Washington and Ottawa possess effective means of persuasion and dissuasion. Nor is the IJC itself powerless where the waters are international. It does not hesitate to criticize offenders, whether public authorities or private industries, and the standing of the Commission, backed by the federal governments, gives weight to its criticisms and recommendations. But, measured against the enormity and urgency of the problem, progress is distressingly slow.

Another major problem under current examination by the Commission is the possibility of establishing a more satisfactory regimen for the levels of the Great Lakes. This is certainly the most extensive hydrological study ever undertaken in North America, perhaps the largest undertaken anywhere. Although the immediate occasion for its initiation was the abnormally low water levels of 1963 and 1964, the risks of high water damage, like that of 1952, are also under study. The object is to seek long-term improvements which would reduce the "range of stage" by bringing some or all of the Lakes under stricter regulation and so improve the situation of riparian and other interests such as navigation and power production.

Of other activities in which the Commission is engaged, a number involve surveillance or control of situations or arrangements already sanctioned. Of these, the most important and best known is that for the regulation of levels and flows on Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River in the interests of those entitled to use the water for purposes including domestic and sanitary supply, navigation and power.

In such matters the order of prior right of use is laid down by the Treaty and the Commission exercises its authority under boards of control. Similar arrangements are made for supervision of regimes established to reduce pollution, and the Commission's technical boards report regularly to the IJC so that any necessary corrective actions can be initiated.

THE FUTURE OF THE COMMISSION

The IJC has demonstrated that the machinery devised by the authors of the Boundary Waters Treaty—a permanent joint body outside the normal diplomatic machinery—is capable of reaching mutually acceptable solutions in one area of relations between Canada and the United States. It is not surprising, therefore, that from time to time proposals have been advanced for extending the Commission's field of action—or at least its method—to other areas of our relations. There is no barrier in the Treaty to such a development.

A suggestion which has gained some currency recently would convert the present Commission into, or replace it by, a supranational institution and endow it with authority to manage all aspects of boundary waters, or at least of the Great Lakes Basin. Such a body would apparently have powers comparable to a domestic administrative or regulatory body, including the power to license and presumably to enforce. This idea appears to derive in part from the "multiplicity" of government agencies in both countries that now have responsibilities over water and its use and from the desirability of greater concentration of authority. It would be so much simpler, it is said, if there were but one duly constituted authority to deal with all water questions.

Such proposals do credit to the zeal and social conscience of their proponents but somewhat less to their sense of present reality and their judgment of the possible in international, let alone national, affairs. If the IJC is to assume this new guise, there would, of course, have to be a new and radically different treaty. For the whole philosophy of the Boundary Waters Treaty is quite opposed to the concept of an international body with administrative and enforcement functions.

The Commission, as presently constituted, is dedicated to the proposition that equitable solutions to common problems can be worked out by close cooperation between jurisdictions—national and international—under agreed principles and upon a foundation of mutual confidence.

This is not to say that there is not room, and hope, in both countries, for improvement in the machinery of national and local government to deal more satisfactorily with the vital and critical problems of water resources. Nor does it mean that the IJC itself could not be strengthened and its procedures improved. Happily, there are grounds for encouragement on the first count. As to the IJC, I am persuaded that, if the governments of the United States and Canada have the will, and provide the means to employ it to its full capacity, the Commission will be able in the future—even more substantially than in the past—to contribute to the solution of these problems and to further strengthen Canada-United States relations.

CONSTRUCTIVE REPUBLICAN COMMENTS ON FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I rise to salute three of my colleagues for foreign policy speeches which they recently delivered.

Last Thursday, in this chamber, the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] presented an instructive survey of changing world realities which, in his judgment, require major changes in U.S. foreign policy. His thoughtful and eloquent statement merits careful study by Members of Congress, responsible officials of the executive branch, and students of foreign affairs.

I am pleased to join my able colleague from Kansas in sponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 198, to establish a National Advisory Commission on Foreign Policy, which he introduced at the conclusion of his remarks. This Commission would be unique because the resolution would require its members to devote at least half of their time to the Commission's work and would authorize appropriate leaves of absence for those Commissioners appointed from the Government.

On the next day, the able minority whip [Mr. KUCHEL] made some interesting remarks about Communist China and the war in Vietnam. His recommendation that the United States ask the United Nations Security Council "to establish a collective guarantee of the territorial integrity of the borders of Vietnam, both north and south, against external attack on either area" will receive, I trust, serious attention by the President and his chief foreign policy advisers.

Finally, Mr. President, I want to commend the able and articulate senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for the series of four speeches which he has given over the past several weeks on the problem of Vietnam. These speeches are typical examples of Senator JAVITS' expert approach to problems of American foreign policy.

The foreign policy statements which I have just cited are illustrative of constructive analysis and criticism, at its best, of U.S. foreign policy by Republican Senators. This is why I have taken this opportunity to salute my three colleagues from Kansas, California, and New York.

THE FORD FOUNDATION TELEVISION PROPOSAL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently the Senate Communications Subcommittee held hearings on a proposal by the Ford Foundation for providing satellite communications for broadcasting in this country. Thereafter W. Theodore Pierson, one of the leading communications lawyers of Washington, took the Ford Foundation proposal as the subject of a very lucid speech. Mr. Pierson is a man of great learning who knows the broadcast industry and its problems intimately and sympathetically. I wish to share my copy of his remarks with my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE DUAL SYSTEM OF TELEVISION BROADCASTING: PROFIT AND NONPROFIT

(Talk by W. Theodore Pierson [1] at the American Women in Radio & Television Southwestern Area Conference, Oklahoma City, Okla., Sept. 17, 1966)

The theme of this conference is "Through The Looking Glass." I take this to mean a look at ourselves—an examination of ourselves. There are several problems with such an exercise.

First of all, we all tend to pose when we look into a mirror and pose in a manner that will make more pleasing the reflection that comes back. So, for this look to be a

[1] Member of the law firm of Pierson, Ball & Dowd, Washington, D.C.

self-examination that has integrity, let's avoid the posing—if we can.

Second, posing to one side, a single mirror will hardly reflect all sides of us. And some sides of us are more attractive than others. So let's have several mirrors and get the front, the back, the right and the left, the top and the bottom. Unposed, if you please. Don't pull in your stomach; wear it like you normally do. I would even suggest that you might take off the girdles and the falsies, but turning this into a strip-tease is probably going farther than Oklahoma laws will permit—though I can't help being intrigued with the idea.

Third, mirrors can be used to tell us about things outside of ourselves—what is in front and back of us and on each side and what is around the corner. This places us in context—the past, the present and the future—the things with which we are surrounded and threatened. These mirrors can reflect things that we could cheer and things that we could fear. But let's avoid the cheering and the fearing. For this exercise to have any real value, we must not emote at these reflections—we must think, think and then act.

This is my keynote. I could as well now sit down. I cannot within the tolerance of your attention to me say all the things that I see in these many mirrors—as nearsighted as I, at times and by some, have been accused of being. In spite of my myopia, I see more than I have time to relate here. But to avoid the embarrassment of having keynoted for only two minutes, I will present a few of my own views.

First, let us contemplate the total spectrum of benefits that the public might receive from perfect performance by the television sector of this electronic world. Then, let us honestly calculate the extent to which commercial broadcasters can fill this spectrum. Even with some irrepressible posing on our part, the ideal spectrum of benefits is substantially larger than can be filled by the commercial broadcaster.

Let us look deeper into the background and see if we can find out why this is so. In honesty to ourselves, which I think is allowable, we cannot say that it is because we are evil money grubbers. Not only do we give much time and money, but making money is the essential goal of private enterprise and the manner in which it plays its public role. Profit-making makes the system produce many of the things that the public wants and should have. Moreover, making profit in a competitive marketplace makes the consumer king—which is hardly an undemocratic or anti-social condition. It helps avoid political kings.

But there is more than this that fairness to ourselves compels. One of the bulwarks against so-called "thought-control" is the primary profit orientation of the commercial press—electronic and print. In our world, where the consumer is king, the press normally works not for political power or influence, but to get profits. To get profits, one need have public acceptance. To get public acceptance over the long-term, one must be creditable to the public. Creditability is inversely related to cognizable attempts to control public opinion. Being accurate and being reliable are important to profit-making. So profit-making for the press, in a competitive system, disciplines against tendencies to control thought and opinion. This is no small virtue.

But we have just looked at the mirrors which show the attractive and ego-fulfilling sides of us. Let's look at another.

While seeking profits in a competitive system has the good effects we have just noted, there is a limit to the system's capacity to fill the model spectrum of television program choices that, ideally, the public should have. In other words, it's simply not enough. To survive in this competition, each broadcaster must get acceptance and patronage from an economically sufficient portion of the public. While a number of his programs are not compensatory in themselves, they do add to the profitability of his whole schedule. And to get this program mix is the art of station operation. But one thing is certain: if the operator overloads with "loss leaders," he will economically sink under their weight—he will not survive to serve anybody with anything.

So, the look at this particular mirror is ego-deflating. We are not all things to all people, and we cannot be. Beyond doubt, we want to serve our publics and our communities. We are devoted to them for both profit and non-profit reasons. But we cannot fill all their needs.

In another direction, we see a non-profit system attempting to develop, which, if it could develop, could supply many of the things to the public that are beyond the limits of our capacity. I refer, of course, to the educational or so-called non-commercial television system. But its growth has been economically stunted. Can you say that this is of no concern of yours? I think not. Many of you have exhibited concern. More needs to be done, particularly in understanding the problem and devising lasting solutions.

In the non-commercial mirror, much in the foreground, is reflected the haloed image of the Ford Foundation. It recently, with an explosion of publicity, proposed a plan to use satellite economies for the benefit of our non-commercial and educational television system. The technical and economic contributions which satellite delivery could make are not new and are certain. In terms of broad national goals and in view of the great public investment in the development of the space medium, special dividends to the public through support of educational systems would seem quite justifiable. But this should not and need not come at a high cost to other national policy objectives.

Since I believe that the Ford proposals, as publicly presented, do exact a high social cost, I would like to examine them with you in some detail.

The Ford Foundation proposes a Broadcaster's [note the possessive] Non-Profit Satellite System which, for short, it calls "BNS." This is a euphemism for what Ford admits is a more descriptive title: a "National Non-Profit Radio & Television Distribution Service." But the latter title is misleading in that, with the short title, one would infer that the BNS undertaking is a humble one limited to supplying the physical means of carriage for the benefit of broadcasters—commercial and non-commercial. This is an illusion—intended or not. At least for the commercial broadcaster, probably for the non-commercial broadcaster, and certainly for our decentralized system of education, BNS could be a Trojan Horse. But what is more, the thing that is in the belly of this animal might be a monster that could drastically and adversely affect our institutions of democracy—and it is not a bit less frightening because it was conceived by a highly sophisticated money-giver with noble aims.

The Ford Foundation proposes that BNS not only carry or distribute commercial network programs to affiliated stations but that, on five other channels, it produce or at least choose and select all programs that BNS carries, which would include the following:

1. "Informational and cultural" programs for the general public, consisting of:

a) News, news interpretation and documentaries.

b) Public affairs programming.

c) Political programming.

d) Entertainment programs of "high quality" (whatever that means).

(Ford, with altogether characteristic charity, leaves to the existing networks "the full gamut of mass entertainment" which it implicitly holds to be of low quality and as including all types of programs other than those it appropriates for BNS.)

2. "Instructive programs" for the students and teachers of all levels of education in the U.S.

Thus, BNS is not merely to perform a carriage or physical distribution function. The Foundation proposes that, in all significant respects, BNS will combine carriage services with (1) program services similar to many of those now furnished by the three national networks and the several syndicated services and (2) services now performed by the many suppliers of textbook and educational materials. Ford emphasizes that BNS is not to be a common carrier, meaning that it will not be obliged to carry all programs offered for carriage, but that, with the monopoly power it will have acquired, will uncommonly be allowed to carry only what it chooses.

To combine in one organization the exclusive economic and technical advantage of such a system as the Foundation proposes, with the power to choose and select what will be carried, in United States terms, would be a social and political catastrophe of great magnitude. It would tend to concentrate control over vast areas of vital mass and educational communications in one foundation-type organization that would inevitably be either the master or the servant of political government.

Whenever, in our history, we have permitted concentration of control over the physical means of communication, as in the cases of telephone and telegraph, we have insisted that such a monopoly have no control over content and that it carry all legal communications offered. Control over content, as in the case of broadcasters, has been permitted only where a competitive market was proposed and was deemed feasible. Monopolistic power over both the means and the content of communication has never been tolerated where it could be avoided. The underlying reasons were not merely economic or what has come to be called "antitrust" considerations. The compelling reason was that democratic institutions could not survive concentrations of power over knowledge and what, of knowledge, is to be communicated.

Thus, Congress provided that broadcasting power be dispersed among a number of competing licensees and among the several states and communities. It mandated a decentralized structure and not a monolithic one. Pursuant to this congressional mandate, the Commission has adopted basic policies in allocating and assigning frequencies and in regulating the industry that propose to avoid, wherever possible, either local or national concentrations of power over the communication of knowledge. The Ford Foundation proposal, in its present form, not only conflicts with these basic policies but would tend to make them fruitless, meaningless and quixotic.

The Ford Foundation in the opening phase of BNS operations proposes that BNS have control over the content of at least 20 channels that would blanket four regions of the United States with five services each. I say "at least" because Ford does not make clear whether BNS would exercise any measure of content control over the 24 channels that would be made available for distribution of the programs of commercial networks.

Included in the five services, with respect to which BNS would be the program selector, would be its own journalistic, public affairs, political and entertainment programming—so-called "cultural and informational" service. The great economic advantage that BNS, as a program and knowledge purveyor, would have over its competition—the national networks—would tend to drive the latter from

the unprofitable "cultural and informational" fields—thus leaving BNS with a virtual monopoly. The networks would tend to be confined to the fields of "mass entertainment"—all as Ford suggests.

Now, to Ford and its coterie of advisors, this might be an appealing prospect, but it would be a tragedy for the freedom of communication of knowledge. And the cataclysmic effect of this disaster could well expand over time.

Direct satellite-to-home distribution of television programs will be economically and technically feasible almost before BNS could start its initial phase. And, if the logic Ford advanced to support the intended undertakings of BNS is acceptable, who but BNS would be the logical entity to take over such services and all the advertising and subscription revenues that BNS could then use in support of its noble "instructive" goals? And then why not expand its services to include facsimile distribution of printed versions of "informational," "cultural" and "instructive" material—e.g., newspapers, periodicals and books?

By this time, and with its great economic advantage, BNS could well become the sole, or at least the primary, source of the educational materials that are used in our educational institutions. It has often been said that our textbook manufacturers are the real programmers of the curricula of our nation's schools. But there is keen competition in this field. And there is the flexibility of choice for each educational unit that a comparative marketplace offers.

How could one achieve greater power over the present and future of our nation than to combine monopolistic power over what is taught in our schools with monopolistic power over the knowledge that is distributed through the print and electronic media?

Is this a ludicrous parade of horrors? I sincerely hope so. But my hope is clouded by Ford's failure to even discuss—let alone deal—with these vital matters. True, Mr. Bundy said that they were primarily interested in generating discussion. But, with all the intellectual talent at its disposal, is it possible that the potential monolithic effects of satellite distribution systems never occurred to Ford? I find this very difficult to believe. If it did occur to the Foundation, how, in its stated interest for a full and complete discussion of the subject, did it fail to even suggest this as an area for serious discussion and study?

My hope is also clouded by the foreknowledge that some of Ford's advisors have been prominent critics of the effectiveness and even of the morality of our profit system for the distribution of "informational and cultural" materials.

My hope is further clouded by Ford's great emphasis upon the "non-profit" and "non-common-carrier" status of BNS. As though "non-profit" enterprises are unadulterated and matchless virtues. I will not throw rocks at charity nor at the great public services that the countless non-governmental non-profit institutions have uniquely contributed to this country's welfare and progress. But no one, no one—government or not—profit or not—should be given the remotest opportunity of establishing monopoly power over the dissemination of knowledge in this country. And we should not reject our national experience: the profit motive that spurs a competitive marketplace, with all its admitted shortcomings, is nevertheless a bulwark against opinion control.

But with all of its contributions, the competitive free enterprise system has left gaps in public service—"cultural," "informational" and "instructive." These gaps need to be filled. An effective parallel non-profit system is a must. Broadcasters should join and work vigorously in their efforts to construct it. And I hope such efforts will be less negative than my discussion of the Ford proposal has been today. I will try to end with a positive and, I hope, a constructive suggestion.

First, let me repeat—it is impossible to believe that the Foundation, with the tremendous intellectual talent at its disposal, can be unaware of the grave social evils that would flow from the birth of BNS, as Ford conceived it. Perhaps it really believed, or perhaps even hoped, that the fetus it had spawned would abort. It is hardly attractive to take up the role of abortionist, but, unless there is a prenatal surgical operation that will modify this fetal monster, abortion is precisely what I suggest for the Ford proposal.

What kind of surgery would help? Principally to make certain that if BNS or anyone else is to have a monopoly over the physical means of distributing communications via satellite, it shall have no control or discretion whatsoever over the content of the broadcasts it carries and shall carry, within the limits of its capacity, all legal communications offered. In other words, it, or whoever supplies the service, shall be a common carrier and not an uncommon monster.

Such surgery might, though not necessarily, destroy the Foundation's hope for producing a pittance—a pittance by its own admission—for support of our country's educational systems. But this, I submit, we can forgo if the pittance would only be food for the monster the Ford proposal might create.

Thank you.

THE SINEWS OF PEACE

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on March 5, 1946, Winston Churchill delivered an address at Westminster College in Fulton, Mo. Although he warned of war the name of the speech was "The Sinews of Peace," and he used for the first time, a phrase, "Iron Curtain," which since has become an integral part of our vocabulary.

Last Thursday, the cornerstone of a memorial to that address was laid on the Westminster campus. The memorial is to be the rebuilt church of St. Mary Aldermanbury which was designed by Christopher Wren in the 17th century and damaged in World War II.

The importance of this event is described well in an editorial which appeared in the Yankton Daily Press and Dakotan of Yankton, S. Dak., October 4.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From Yankton (S. Dak.) Daily Press & Dakotan, Oct. 4, 1966]

MEMORIAL TO IMMORTAL WORDS

To all the other distinctions earned by Winston Churchill in his lifetime, another is being conferred upon him 21 months after his death. It is perhaps unique in history—a memorial to a speech.

It was on March 5, 1946, that Churchill, recently turned out of office by the nation he had led through World War II, delivered an address at Westminster College in Fulton, Mo., that was to rank in fame second only to the "blood, sweat and tears" with which he inspired the British people in 1940.

"From Stettin in the Baltic," said Churchill, "to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the continent."

The "iron curtain" speech put the little college on the map and the phrase immediately entered the vocabulary. Churchill's words also shocked the democracies into the realization that the wartime alliance between Russia and the West was at an end and that even as in 1919, when men were congratulating themselves on having won "the war to end wars," the seeds of even greater conflict to come were already sprouting.

The memorial, whose cornerstone is to be laid on the Westminster campus on Oct. 6, will be a rebuilt London landmark, the church of St. Mary Aldermanbury. Designed by Christopher Wren in the 17th century, it was damaged in World War II and was at one time scheduled for destruction.

More than a million dollars have been contributed to the restoration fund. Additional monies are still needed for an attached museum and library which will hold a collection of Churchill paintings, manuscripts and memorabilia.

It is nearly forgotten that the title of Churchill's speech was "The Sinews of Peace." While he warned of war, his emphasis was on the strengthening of freedom so that "the high roads of the future will be clear, not only for us, but for all, not only for our time, but for the century to come."

Today, some 20 years later, the Iron Curtain still exists, but the conditions on which Churchill based his somber pronouncement are startlingly changed. Europe is a miracle removed from the shambles it was in then. The expansion of communism has long since been blunted and disarray infects the Communist bloc the world over.

We think that if Churchill were alive to speak again at Fulton, he would tell us that not only from Stettin to Trieste but from Seoul to Saigon, even in the midst of a local war and universal crisis, a curtain is lifting before the eyes of men, showing them a vision of peace and progress such as they have never seen before.

That this is so is due in no small measure to the fact that a man named Winston Churchill once lived and spoke.

WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION PROJECTS APPROVED BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, in order that the Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, and other interested parties may be advised of the various projects approved by the Committee on Public Works on October 10, 1966, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, information on this matter:

Projects approved by the Committee on Public Works under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 566, 83d Congress, as amended

Project	*Estimated Federal cost*
Georgia, Little Sandy and Trail Creek	$1,286,141
Oklahoma, Caston-Mountain Creek	1,863,379
Texas, Choctaw Creek	4,837,546
Total	7,987,066

BUILDING PROJECTS APPROVED BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, in order that the Members of the Senate and of the House, particularly the Committees on Appropriations, and other interested parties, may be advised of the public building projects approved by the Committee on Public Works on October

10, 1966, under the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, information on the following projects:

NEW CONSTRUCTION	*Federal estimated cost*
Los Angeles, Calif.: Federal Office Bldg. (supplement), parking facility	$5,582,000
Porthill, Idaho: Border station	230,900
Dayton, Ohio:	
(a) Post office building (revised)	7,292,000
(b) Courthouse and FOB	4,738,000
Fort Worth, Tex.: Federal office building (supplemental) parking facility	3,081,000
ALTERATIONS AND EXTENSIONS	
St. Louis, Mo.: Ordnance	9,266,000
Cleveland, Ohio: Post office, custom house and courthouse	1,090,000
Fort Worth, Tex.: Federal center (formerly Army depot)	3,081,000
Tyler, Tex.: Post office and courthouse (extension)	2,279,000

U.S.S. "UTAH"

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, almost everyone knows about the 1,102 American officers and men who lie entombed in the hulk of the U.S.S. *Arizona* at Pearl Harbor. Many tributes have been paid to them and their bravery under Japanese fire in the infamous attack of December 7, 1941. A grateful Nation has erected a handsome monument over the *Arizona* where the colors are flown every day.

But relatively few people realize that the same recognition has not been given to 54 other officers and men who also lost their lives in the Pearl Harbor attack, and who lie entombed in the U.S.S. *Utah* only a few miles away. Their resting place is identified only by a small plaque.

I have been trying to do something about this now since early in 1963—through four sessions of the Congress. I introduced a bill in the 88th Congress directing the Secretary of the Navy to have a flagpole erected over the U.S.S. *Utah* which lies half submerged off Ford Island, and to direct that the colors be raised and lowered each day. I reintroduced the bill at the beginning of the 89th Congress.

In each Congress the measure has been cosponsored by more than 30 other Members of the Senate. President Kennedy expressed interest in the bill, as has President Johnson. Yet I have been unable to get hearings held on it, although I have repeatedly requested them. I had sincerely hoped that the colors could be raised for the first time next December 7—on the 25th anniversary of the Pearl Harbor attack. I am deeply disappointed that this cannot be done.

The Department of the Navy insists that the flag which flies over the U.S.S. *Arizona* is for all of the Pearl Harbor dead. This implies that if our flag were flown over the *Utah* it would detract from the flag and memorial over the *Arizona*. I do not agree and I do not feel we in the Congress should let the Department of the Navy tell us what we should do about this. The *Utah* is on the opposite side of Ford Island, out of view of the *Arizona*. It is a separate ship in a separate location. Moreover, there are separate flags flying over other Pearl Harbor dead who are buried in land cemeteries nearby—and the *Utah* is just as much a military cemetery as any plot of ground containing graves and the granite markers and flowers. Flying the flag over the *Utah*, and raising and lowering it each day, would give similar recognition to its men.

Almost every State, and certainly every area of the country, has one or more of its boys listed among the U.S.S. *Utah* dead. Of the 43 men whose bodies were not found or identified, 13 gave California as their home State; 11, Texas; 3 each Illinois, Iowa, Washington State and New York; 2 each Colorado, Missouri, Virginia and Massachusetts; 1 each Kentucky, Arkansas, Minnesota, Louisiana, Michigan, Oregon, Ohio, and Nebraska; and one who did not list his home. He was, however, born in Iowa. Another man was a native of the Philippine Islands. Many men showed next-of-kin in States other than their home at time of enlistment, so there is hardly a State which is not touched in some way by the ghostly hand of those entombed in the U.S.S. *Utah*.

Mr. President, the more than 30 sponsors of this bill in the Senate are not asking for an elaborate or costly memorial structure for the U.S.S. *Utah*. We are asking only for a simple standard from which our national emblem can be raised with each dawn and lowered with each sunset so that all who see it can remember and honor the brave men who lie under it. We ask only for the men of the U.S.S. *Utah* the same recognition which is willingly given to our other military dead wherever they may lie the world over.

Since this 89th Congress will now shortly adjourn, I realize that we probably cannot take action on the U.S.S. *Utah* bill before adjournment. I shall reintroduced the bill in the 90th Congress. I feel I cannot give up on it. We owe this recognition to the men who died for their country and who are now entombed in the ship. I hope that even a greater number of my colleagues will feel moved to cosponsor the measure next year. I shall begin the fight anew and do everything I can to get the bill considered and passed.

ADDRESS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY W. TRUE DAVIS BEFORE MISSOURI BANKERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, all Americans are today concerned over the inflationary pressures that are affecting our economy. To maintain our prosperity and preserve the unprecedented gains of the past few years while dampening these pressures is the vital task now challenging our society. Assistant Secretary of the Treasury W. True Davis, speaking before the Missouri Bankers Association on October 5, discussed our Nation's economic objectives. In doing so, he outlined the achievements of our economy since 1961 and explained clearly the administration's program to meet the current challenge.

I believe Assistant Secretary Davis' comments will be of great interest to all Members of the Senate, particularly as we consider the President's recommendations to suspend the investment tax credit and accelerated depreciation procedures.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Assistant Secretary Davis' speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL ECONOMIC OBJECTIVES

(Remarks by the Honorable W. True Davis, Assistant Secretary, at the Missouri Bankers Association, St. Joseph, Mo., October 5, 1966)

It is good to be home again, and it is a pleasure to meet with bankers of the State of Missouri. For you, more than any other group of citizens, are afforded a continuous opportunity to gain a clear perspective and sensitive understanding of financial and economic conditions within your immediate communities. We in the Treasury are indebted to you, and to the entire banking fraternity, for the steady inflow of financial and business intelligence with which you provide us. This indispensable intelligence assists us in formulating future contingency plans and in initiating immediate measures to insure continued economic growth and stability.

We in the Treasury and you in the banking fraternity have mutual interests and concerns. The most important of these concerns are the economic welfare of our country and the individual well-being of our citizens. For the past six years, this Administration, as President Johnson recently stated, has been trying to make economic policy "the servant of our quest to make American society not only prosperous but progressive, not only affluent but humane, offering not only higher income but wider responsibilities, its people enjoying not only full employment but fuller lives."

No nation has ever enjoyed such prosperity, nor have so many people at one time ever participated in such prosperity. Almost 76.5 million people are now working, and less than four percent of our labor force is unemployed. Our economy today is healthy and strong. For 68 months—more than five and one-half years—the trend of our economy has been pointed in one direction only; and that direction is up! The remarkable, the unique feature of this rise has been the fact that it has taken place in the presence of a fine balance of consumer demand and capacity to produce.

Today's prosperity did not come about by accident. Today's prosperity is the direct result of this Administration's intelligent and wise use of economic, fiscal, and monetary policies since 1961. President Johnson's anti-inflation program, now before the Congress, is designed to preserve this fine balance of demand and capacity to produce, and to extend our gains through a call upon all—business, consumers, the Federal Government and the Congress—for responsible economic conduct in the months and years ahead.

It was Proust who pointed out that in the remembrances and understanding of things past the present becomes more viable, more meaningful, more clearly comprehended. Remembrances of economic conditions in the past is essential if we are to have a clear perspective of how far we have progressed, how solid that progression now is, and how firm the foundations are for building the future. When our current economic expansion began in 1961, our economy was only

slowly emerging from a protracted recession.

This recession was only one of four with which we had been afflicted during the postwar years. Unemployment was intolerably high, and business investment was abnormally low. It had failed to maintain adequate levels of growth, and it was far less than necessary to generate vigorous economic growth and enable us to compete in world markets against other industrialized countries whose annual rate of growth surpassed ours. We were also plagued with a chronic series of deficits in our international balance of payments. These averaged more than $3½ billion a year for three years. They not only rendered the dollar vulnerable, but they threatened the international monetary system which the dollar supported.

It is true that prices had remained relatively stable during the 1958–1961 period. This price stability, however, was achieved at the expense of not achieving our national goals of full employment and sustained, adequate economic growth. It was the result not of a pattern of positive and productive growth, but rather the result of a pattern of anemic and inadequate growth that had shown itself exceedingly susceptible to recession.

Our aim in 1961—even as now—was to pursue and achieve four national economic goals simultaneously: price stability; strong and sustained economic growth; full employment; relative equilibrium in our international balance of payments.

To an extent unprecedented in a free economy we have moved—simultaneously—toward these accomplishments. We have refused—and we still refuse—to accept the old thesis that high employment can only be achieved at the expense of price stability, or that price stability must be accompanied by considerable unemployment. These economic goals are not incompatible. It was not necessary then, nor is it now, to sacrifice any one of these goals in our pursuit to secure and maintain all of them. Our course of action then—as now—was to take a flexible step-by-step approach to the solution of our economic problems and the achievement of our national economic goals. In pursuing this course we recognized then—as we do now—that inevitable conflicts will arise in the attainment of these goals. The existence of such conflicts, however, does not negate the wisdom of our approach to their solution, nor justify our pursuit of one goal at the expense of another. It merely means that we rationally determine the relative speed with which we wish to simultaneously pursue all of our goals.

To restore the vitality of the private economy, it was essential to liberate American enterprise from policies that had stifled private investment. It was imperative to provide business incentives that would enable business and industry to expand and grow, thus enabling them successfully to meet increasing foreign competition, while providing jobs to alleviate chronic unemployment. To bring this about, the Treasury early in 1962 revised depreciation guide-lines for tax purposes, and, at the President's request, Congress enacted a tax credit of 7 percent on new investment in machinery and equipment. These measures encouraged productive new business investment that meant new jobs, greater economic growth, greater productivity and lower costs—all of which are essential to continued price stability and progress in our international balance of payments.

Simultaneously, we undertook a massive effort to attack the problem of structural unemployment by adopting pioneering new efforts to train and retrain unskilled and semi-skilled workers to make them more employable and more productive.

Paralleling these fiscal measures—revised depreciation guide-lines and the 7 percent investment tax credit—we also adopted a dual approach to over-all economic policy. Through a massive, across-the-board income tax reduction we sought to increase the general level of demand in the private economy and to enhance the incentives for productive investment. Through wage-price guidelines, we encouraged wage-price restraint so that measures for growing productivity and for growing aggregate demand would result in rapid and real economic growth.

Debt management during this period was called upon to support the Administration's efforts to stimulate the economy, help achieve our balance of payments objectives, and help maintain a financial environment favorable to home expansion and external balance. By adding to the market supply of very short-term issues, notably Treasury bills, the Treasury materially assisted the Federal Reserve System in maintaining our short-term money market rates in reasonable alignment with those abroad. This appreciably reduced the incentives for short-term capital flows to foreign money markets.

The Treasury also issues short-term bonds to foreign monetary authorities, denominated in their own currencies, as a means of absorbing foreign monetary balances that might have otherwise been pressed upon us for conversion into gold.

Such measures in the fiscal, monetary, and economic areas as I have briefly discussed had the desired effect of reducing our balance of payments deficit to more manageable proportions, appreciably encouraging the free flow of credit so vital to industry, home buyers, and State and local governments, and stimulating the economy by promoting necessary business and industrial expansion. The end result of these enlightened policies was the greatest upsurge of economic well-being in the history of the world.

A few notable statistics emphasize our achievements.

Gross National Product: In 1960, our GNP totaled $503.8 billion. Today our GNP is running at an annual rate of more than $732.6 billion.

Personal Income: In 1960, total personal income amounted to $401 billion. In August of 1966, it was running at an estimated annual rate of $585 billion.

Corporate Profits after Taxes ran at an all-time high of some $48.7 billion in the first half of this year. This compares most favorably with the $26.7 billion rate of after-tax corporate profit in 1960.

Personal Income per capita of the Farm Population rose sharply in 1965 to almost 30 percent above the 1964 level. The situation continues to improve this year.

Almost every American has benefited from the prosperity of the Sixties. So, too, have tens of millions of people throughout the world through our agricultural and financial assistance programs which reflect this prosperity and economic growth.

Maintaining this prosperity and preserving our unprecedented gains, while we dampen those inflationary pressures that during the past few months have adversely affected our economy, is the vital task that challenges our free society today.

To achieve our desired objective—price stability and economic growth—the President sent to Congress on September 8, an anti-inflation program, which incorporated the following principal, inter-related elements:

1. Measures to Reduce Federal Expenditures:

As part of his anti-inflation drive, President Johnson has directed all agency heads to hold employment in full-time permanent positions for the remainder of this fiscal year at or below the level of July 31, 1966. Those agencies whose employment now exceeds the July 31 level are to reduce their employment as expeditiously as possible.

Employment in temporary, part-time, or intermittent positions for the remainder of this fiscal year will also be held at, or reduced to, the prevailing level as of June 30 of this year.

To meet the employment ceilings established by the President, he directed Federal agencies to increase their productivity, redeploy personnel, simplify procedures, and strip work to essentials. The President also directed them to reduce total overtime pay for this fiscal year to the level contemplated in the President's budget recommendations for fiscal year 1967, or to a level 25 percent below the actual overtime pay for fiscal year 1966.

The President directed that lower priority Federal programs be reduced by $1.5 billion during the present fiscal year. This will be accomplished by deferring, stretching out, or reducing contracts, new orders, and commitments. Each major agency has been given a savings target with orders to meet that target.

The President will also defer and reduce Federal Expenditures:

By requesting appropriations for Federal programs at levels substantially below those now being authorized by the Congress;

By withholding appropriations provided above budget recommendations whenever possible; and

By cutting spending in other areas which have significant fiscal impact in 1967.

The total reduction in federal expenditures resulting from these measures this fiscal year will be at least—and probably more than—$3 billion.

This reduction in Federal spending will not be at the expense of necessary, vital programs essential to raising the quality of American life—the education of our children, providing for their health, rebuilding our decaying cities, and eradicating diseases that daily destroy or irreparably damage the lives of millions of Americans.

Nor will this reduction in Federal spending be at the expense of our country's efforts to preserve the peace.

Rather, this reduction in Federal spending that the President has requested will reflect our continued efforts to operate at greater levels of efficiency and reduce to a minimum non-essential programs in the pursuit of our national goals.

2. Suspension of Special Tax Incentives to Investment:

The second important element in the President's anti-inflation message to the Congress deals with the suspension of the special incentives to investment, including the 7 percent tax credit on investment and accelerated depreciation procedures. The President has asked that these incentives be suspended for 16 months, beginning September 1, 1966, and ending January 1, 1968.

Why is the suspension of the 7 percent investment tax credit enacted in 1962 now necessary? The answer is that the current demands thrust upon our machinery and equipment industries are too great to be absorbed.

This year business intends to spend 17 percent more on plant and equipment than it spent last year. This increased expenditure comes upon the top of a 15.5 percent increase in 1965, and a 14.5 increase in 1964. Investment in machinery and equipment during the past three years has risen more than twice as fast as our Gross National Product. It is taking place today, moreover, despite higher interest rates and tighter money.

This capital-goods demand falls on top of the extraordinary burden placed on the economy by the accelerated increase during the past year of the costs of our defense of freedom in Vietnam. Capital-goods demands have created such a demand for investment credit that during the past few months there has been an unprecedented rise in interest rates that has created many inequities, such as a shortage of funds for home buyers, that can no longer be tolerated.

Consequently, the temporary suspension of this investment incentive, which will relieve excessive pressures on capital goods producers and on our financial markets, is now as necessary to the stabilization of our Nation's economic growth as its initiation once was to its stimulation and development.

Just as machinery and equipment outlays are stimulated by the investment tax credit, so outlays for construction of commercial and industrial buildings are stimulated by accelerated depreciation. Like the investment tax credit, accelerated depreciation is today contributing to inflationary pressures. Both logic and equity require its temporary suspension, along with suspension of the investment tax credit.

3. Federal Reserve Board and Large Commercial Banks:

The third element of the President's anti-inflation program is concerned with abatement of pressures on interest rates and avoiding inequitable effects of very tight money. The President urged the Federal Reserve Board, in executing its policy of monetary restraint, and our large commercial banks, to cooperate with him and the Congress to lower interest rates and to ease the inequitable burden of tight money.

One aspect of the President's recommendation in this area has already been completed. Two weeks ago the Congress passed and the President signed a law which provides Federal agencies with additional flexible authority to set interest ceilings on bank time deposits and savings and loan accounts. As you know, the Federal Reserve, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board all moved promptly to regulate the fierce competition for consumer savings which has tended to push up interest rates and divert funds away from home building and buying.

As part of the President's program to help reduce current pressures on the money market and on interest rates, he directed Treasury Secretary Fowler to review all potential Federal security sales. Secretary Fowler did so promptly, and on September 10 announced a program for keeping Federal pressures on the money market at a minimum. The main points in the Secretary's program include:

Cancelling the sale of FNMA participation certificates tentatively scheduled for September, with no further FNMA participation sale in the market for the rest of 1966 unless market conditions improve;

Discontinuing Export-Import Bank sales of additional participation certificates in the market for the rest of the calendar year; and

Limiting market sales of Federal agency securities in the aggregate to an amount required to replace maturing issues, while raising new money only to the extent genuinely needed through sales of agency securities to Government investment accounts.

These measures clearly indicate the Administration's determination to restrain inflationary pressures. In turn, the President hopes that the financial community will seize the earliest opportunity to lower interest rates and improve the allocation of existing supplies of credit.

The anti-inflation program laid before the Congress on September 8 was the latest move in a careful step-by-step program on the part of the Administration over the past year to combat the threat of inflation where and when it has appeared. The Administration has acted—successfully—to avoid inflationary pressures in consumer demand, as it is now acting to abate pressures in the capital goods market. Actions which the Administration has already taken, beginning last January, have resulted in the removal of $10 billion of excess purchasing power from the economy. This was achieved by:

Increasing by $6 billion payroll taxes for social security and medicare.

Restoring $1 billion in excise taxes.

Withholding an additional $1 billion in income taxes.

Speeding up by $1 billion corporate tax payments.

Administrative acceleration of tax payments by $1 billion.

Moreover, action has been taken to redress the sharp impact of monetary restraint on home building. With the signing of the Federal National Mortgage Association Bill early last month, there was a large potential increase in the availability of money for home mortgages. In time, the $1 billion special assistance program and the expansion of FNMA secondary market purchase authority by $3.75 billion could finance 300,000 new homes.

Earlier I mentioned that the fiscal and monetary measures employed by this Administration enabled us to pursue all of our national economic goals simultaneously. One goal was to achieve equilibrium in our balance of payments deficit. Although we have had considerable success during the past five and one-half years in this pursuit, the problem still exists. Last year, our payments deficit was $1.3 billion on a liquidity basis. So far this year, it is running at about the same rate—despite a rapid increase in the foreign exchange costs of our defense of freedom in Asia running about $1 billion more than a year earlier. We have a payment deficit on military account of $2.6 billion and on foreign aid account of three-quarters of a billion dollars. The total of these two items together is about two and one-half times our overall deficit. We intend to correct this. As Secretary Fowler said last week in his address before the annual meeting in the nation's capital of the International Monetary Fund: "We want and intend to attain balance. We do not intend in the future to meet the world reserve needs by an American deficit." How we solve our payments deficit will depend "on the composite result of our own efforts and the policies of other countries, particularly the countries in persistent surplus." But solve our problem we will.

The practicing of economic restraint and the acceptance of economic responsibility rests not alone with the Executive and Administrative branches of the Federal Government. Since we are all concerned, since we are all involved in the continued economic growth of our country and the economic well-being of our fellow Americans, we must practice restraint and assume our individual share of national economic responsibility. Our individual and collective efforts now, as in the immediate future, should be directed to eliminating inflationary pressures on our economy that are imposing unnecessary hardships on millions of Americans and threatening the security of our economic achievements of the past six years.

The financial community, of which you form a vital part, has an extremely important role to play in accomplishing this objective. The President has asked that you seize the earliest opportunity to lower interest rates and improve the allocation of existing supplies of credit. Banks should handle money and credit equitably, without extracting excessive profits, relying less on high interest rates to price borrowers out of the market and more on the placing of appropriate credit ceilings.

American business should base demands for credit on genuine needs, maintain inventories based on current requirements, postpone unnecessary investment projects, establish prices based on real costs, and limit profits to those appropriate for a steadily expanding economy.

The course of action that President Johnson set down in his economic message to the Congress, which I have reviewed briefly with you, is designed to keep the American economy on the safe course of stable prosperity that it has enjoyed for the past five and one-half years. It is a flexible course, not a rigid course. Should future conditions require its implementation, then additional steps will be taken to insure the pursuit and attainment of our goal. That goal, as I have emphasized, is to maintain a strong, vigorous, balanced economy.

The maintenance of an economy that grows in good balance is imperative for the achievement of our national goals, for the successful prosecution of our efforts to bring peace to the people of Vietnam and Southeast Asia, and for continuing our assistance throughout the world to developing nations in their efforts to raise their living standards while they eradicate social ills that breed revolution and war.

The principal theme of our endeavors—equally of interest to business, banking, labor, government, and individual citizens—must be in the future as it has been in the past—cooperation, good will, and mutual trust. Working together we can solve any problem, settle any dispute, resolve any difference. This will not be difficult, for working together, utilizing human resources and talents, is the American way of doing things.

SHIFT FROM COEXISTENCE TO PEACEFUL ENGAGEMENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, President Johnson's speech of last Friday to the National Conference of Editorial Writers offers opportunity, as he said, to "shift from the narrow concept of coexistence to the broader vision of peaceful engagement."

I hope officials of the Soviet Union will read the statement carefully and make it available to their citizens. I believe the President has given voice to the deep-seated conviction of most Americans that the world's superpowers have more in common than in disagreement.

The President's remarks of last Friday spelled out details of ways in which these two great powers can move toward making the world safe for mankind. This speech is the logical next step to his speech at Idaho Falls, where he said:

> Our compelling task is this: to search for every possible area of agreement that might conceivably enlarge, no matter how slightly or how slowly, the prospect for cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union. In the benefits of such cooperation, the whole world would share and so, I think, would both nations.

The President's thoughts at Idaho Falls, elaborated to the editorial writers, are an extension of those he expressed in December of 1964, when he called on the United States "to build new bridges to Eastern Europe—bridges of ideas, education, culture, trade, technical cooperation and mutual understanding for world peace and prosperity."

In the building of these bridges, East-West agreements have been sought such as the consular convention now before the Senate, a bilateral Aviation Agreement, and the East-West Trade Relations Act of 1966. No one expects that when these proposals are finally agreed to there will be changes in the basic nature of Eastern Europe's political system or that longstanding animosities between East and West will be eliminated. What I believe the President expects is that a broadening of cultural

and educational exchanges and an expansion of trade will have a salutary effect on East-West political relationships.

In a world where the United States and the Soviet Union are uncomfortably bound together by the mutual capacity to destroy each other, it is important to our survival that our mutual stake in military stability and responsible behavior be protected and strengthened. The ties of trade and cultural exchange are some of the few channels available to us to shape mutually advantageous relations. To put it another way, the interdependence of the Soviet Union and the United States inspired by the fear of mutual annihilation must gradually be replaced by economic and cultural interdependence. Expanded trade with Eastern Europe and educational and cultural exchange agreements serve to stimulate the contact of peoples and the exchange of ideas; and this should not be feared, but welcomed.

Mr. President, I think we are aware of the obstacles that exist both within Congress and throughout the country to a broadening of our commercial and cultural contacts with Eastern Europe. I am not entirely sure what critics fear from increased contact with the East. In time, the intimate contact of peoples and ideas brought on by an expansion of trade and cultural relations with Eastern Europe will alter the attitudes and outlook of the participants themselves. Do we really have reason to fear the changes in attitude that an improvement of our relations with Eastern Europe will bring? I believe that we should have more confidence in our own political and economic system and our intelligence.

I realize all too well that the turmoil of Vietnam impedes the building of the bridges to the East that President Johnson seeks. Nevertheless, I share his hope and commend his determination that the United States will pursue every chance of communication and contact with the East in spite of Vietnam.

One area where some of the barriers to East-West understanding could be removed is the still contentious issue of the settlement of Russia's World War II lend-lease debts to the United States. The United States during the settlement negotiations in 1951–52 offered to reduce the lend-lease debt to $800 million, while the Soviet Union in the course of the negotiations raised its initial counteroffer to $300 million. Despite a brief resumption of these negotiations in 1960, the issue remains totally deadlocked.

Surely there must be some way of breaking this impasse if we apply the determined spirit to search for every possible area of agreement with the Soviet Union called for by President Johnson in his Idaho Falls speech and his speech to the editorial writers. Moreover, we have recently received yet another indication that the Soviet Union is remarkably flexible and pragmatic in its approach to commercial and financial dealings with the West.

According to the press, several months ago the Russian Government and the Italian Fiat Automobile Co. signed an agreement whereby Fiat will participate in the building of an automobile factory in the Soviet Ukraine. By this arrangement, Italy's share, in the form of credits to Moscow, represents some $322 million of the almost $800 million total cost of the facilities. For their part, the Soviets will provide another $300 million primarily in plant and labor costs, while Britain and France and probably the United States will extend credit for machinery, tools, and other heavy equipment. I might also note that late last month a Soviet Minister of Trade, in describing a Soviet 5-year plan calling for the production of some 800,000 automobiles by 1970, spoke of the "broad opportunities for the expansion" of commercial contacts with the West. The Fiat arrangement will clearly play an important role in this expansion of East-West commercial contacts.

Press reports as recently as October 8 describe an approach made to the Ford Motor Co. by the Soviet Union for assistance in the construction of production facilities in Russia. Apparently those approaches were rebuffed.

But the French are interested and are negotiating for the construction of a Renault plant in the Soviet Union, even if we are not.

While I do not wish to attach undue significance to economic and technical joint ventures of East and West of this kind, these automobile projects do, nevertheless, provide one more indication that the challenges and opportunities of practical economic cooperation are gradually eroding the barriers of ideological differences. I am encouraged that the U.S. business firms may participate in the Fiat contract by providing modern machinery such as heavy forges and presses. I can only hope that these business arrangements will not be undermined by the kind of mischievous domestic pressure that destroyed plans of Firestone International to construct two synthetic rubber plants in Rumania.

However important this automobile agreement may be to the future of the Soviet Union's consumer industries or the development of larger European markets—markets embracing, as they should, the Soviet Union—it will also bring, I feel, some political and psychological benefits. These are the benefits of a developing habit of East-West cooperation in commercial enterprises.

It seems to me that the Fiat example of East-West cooperation holds out the promise of similar cooperation in other areas. If the Soviet Union can merge its resources with those of the West in the development of joint projects in the Soviet Union itself, there is no reason why the United States and the Soviet Union could not combine their resources and technological skills in joint efforts in other areas of the world. The model of East-West joint development of an automobile plant in the Soviet Union could be applied to the joint development of a fertilizer plant in India or the United Arab Republic. There is no better way to foster the habits of cooperation than to participate in cooperative enterprises—be it an automobile plant in Russia or a fertilizer plant in India. Such limited cooperative ventures, I believe, will also engender a sense that cooperation is possible in other areas, be they military or political.

With this model of a cooperative project with the Soviet Union in mind, it seems to me that a similar cooperative enterprise with the Russians could be a way to break the deadlock over the settlement of the Soviet Union's World War II lend-lease debts to the United States.

One proposal which might prove mutually acceptable would be a compromise settlement whereby the United States would accept the Soviet cash offer of $300 million and then commit the amount in dispute—some $500 million—to a joint Soviet-United States development fund for use within the Soviet Union or in third countries. As for the question of what direct return the United States would receive from committing to a joint development fund money which, after all, is owed to us, the understanding would be that a part of the settlement would be placed in a ruble account placed to the credit of the United States, to be drawn down by American scholars and other Government grantees, and perhaps for American firms to cover land and local construction costs of plants built in the Soviet Union.

I realize that this proposal is vulnerable to the charge that the money for this fund is, in actuality, entirely U.S. funds, since the Russians owe us the amount they would be asked to contribute. But the same charge could have been raised against past debt and surplus property settlements from which settlement funds have been used to create educational exchange and cultural programs. Moreover, we must look at the reality of the matter: negotiations to resolve the amount in dispute have been stalled for 6 years, and I see no prospect of narrowing the gap between the Soviet offer and the U.S. demands.

At the moment, we have neither the $300 million in hard currency that a settlement along the lines I have suggested would bring nor the use of the amount in dispute for any purpose. I suggest that there are moments in a nation's life when a "half a loaf" is better than none at all. That is particularly true in this case where the benefits of such a settlement may go far beyond the confines of credit-debit ledgers.

Such a joint development fund would be a practical way to build economic bridges of cooperation between East and West. The Fiat arrangement has demonstrated the possibilities of joint ventures; to build on this model with the development of an East-West development fund would, I believe, make a significant advance toward a genuine international community. Both in symbol and substance the process of commercial cooperation will breed new expectations and attitudes in our relationship with Eastern Europe. And men and nations can only be the better for it.

I urge the administration, therefore, to give serious consideration to negotiations for the establishment of an East-West development fund for use in American-Soviet joint commercial ventures and as

a source of support for educational and cultural exchange programs with the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement entitled "Background on Lend-Lease Indebtedness"; an article entitled "France Seeks Top Position in Trade With East Europe," written by Bernard D. Nossiter, and published in the Washington Post of October 8, 1966; and an article entitled "Ford Disdains Reds' Car Deal," written by Robert W. Irvin, and published in the Washington Post of October 8, 1966.

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

BACKGROUND ON LEND-LEASE INDEBTEDNESS

The United States has been unable to reach a settlement with the Soviet Government for lend-lease assistance which was delivered before V–J Day. (The Soviet Union has agreed to pay for lend-lease delivered after V–J Day).

The United States furnished approximately $10.8 billion worth of lend-lease assistance to the Soviet Union up to V–J Day. In seeking a settlement of this lend-lease account of the Soviet Government, the United States has followed the basic principles and policies which governed lend-lease settlements with other governments. The Soviet Government has been asked to pay the reasonable value of civilian-type lend-lease articles on hand in the Soviet Union at V–J Day which would be useful in peacetime. Since the U.S.S.R. did not provide an inventory of such articles, the United States prepared one which showed the value as $2.6 billion. An additional problem relates to the disposition to be made of 84 lend-lease merchant ships and 49 miscellaneous army and navy watercraft still in Soviet custody, the value of which is not included in the $2.6 billion figure.

During the initial negotiations the United States in 1948 requested the U.S.S.R. to pay $1.3 billion as the first step in the negotiating process. The Soviet Government had offered to pay $170 million. During subsequent negotiations in 1951–52, the U.S. figure was reduced to $800 million. In the interest of obtaining a prompt settlement, the United States indicated its readiness to reduce this sum further provided the Soviet Government increased its offer, which at the time was $240 million, to a sum more nearly reflecting the value of the articles in the peacetime economy of the Soviet Union. The U.S.S.R. increased its offer to $300 million. The United States did not consider this sum adequate and rejected the offer in 1952. The foregoing sums do not include settlement for any ships since these were to be dealt with as a separate part of the overall negotiations. No further settlement offer has been received from the U.S.S.R.

At the request of the United States, negotiations were resumed on January 11, 1960. The United States proceeded on the understanding that the negotiations were to deal solely with a lend-lease settlement. When the discussions began, however, the Soviet Government insisted that a lend-lease settlement could not be considered as a separate and independent problem.

Under these circumstances there was no agreement on the terms of reference of the negotiations and there appeared to be no common ground for continuing the discussions at that time. The last meeting was held on January 27, 1960. The United States informed the Soviet Government that it is prepared to resume negotiations for an over-all lend-lease settlement at any time the Soviet Government is ready to negotiate on this as a separate and independent issue.

Source: Department of State Press Release of October 1962 and collecting agency (Treasury Department) reports to OBE.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 8, 1966]

WOULD SUPPLANT GERMANY: FRANCE SEEKS TOP POSITION IN TRADE WITH EAST EUROPE

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

PARIS, October 7.—France is making a bold bid to supplant Germany as the West's chief trading partner in Eastern Europe, it was learned today.

Authorities here are privately forecasting that they will take over the top position within a year. Trade figures give some support to their optimism, showing a striking increase in French exchanges with the Communist countries tihs year. But Germany, however, still holds a sizable lead.

The Paris prediction was made on the eve of a fresh round of talks with a high-powered Russian trade delegation. A Moscow team that included six vice ministers is due here tomorrow.

The French objective appears to be both commercial and political. Officials here are convinced that the Soviet Union and its European allies are planning a big expansion in consumer goods. Paris wants to be in the ground floor.

At the same time, France hopes that trade pre-eminence will strengthen her claim to be regarded as the first Western political voice that the East will heed.

Although exchanges with the East are rising rapidly, trade with the Soviet Union has fallen far behind schedule. A major goal of the delegation coming here is to straighten this out.

Under the five-year agreement signed in 1964, France was to sell Russia $160 million annually. In fact, last year's exports were only $72 million and are $32 million in the first half of this year.

This lag is blamed on Russia's need to buy large amounts of wheat in the West and on the Soviet Union's rigidity in dealing with Western markets.

French officials think that better harvests in Russia and Eastern Europe will take care of the first problem. They hope to solve the second by setting up special import-export firms to deal with Communist nations.

The most important talks here are expected to be those between Michel Debre, the finance minister and N. N. Mirotvortsev, vice minister of the Gosplan or planning organization.

The French hope that these discussions will lay the base for a big increase in sales of everything from wine to automobile plants. The Russians have been negotiating with the nationalized Renault Co. to build a complex turning out 500,000 cars a year. Paris was deeply disappointed that the first such deal was signed with Fiat of Italy and the Russians are aware of the French chagrin.

Can France dislodge Germany from her leading trade role? Last year, the Germans exchanged $1.2 billion worth with Eastern Europe, more than twice the $570 million of France.

But in the first six months of this year, French trade with the East has risen to a yearly rate of nearly $750 million, a remarkable gain of 30 per cent. At the same time, the German trade eastward has been unchanged, partly through government policy. If Bonn continues to hold a lid on her exchanges, she could indeed be overtaken by France.

Impressive as the French drive appears, trade with the East is still a relatively marginal affair. For both France and Germany, it runs only a bit above 3 per cent of all exports and imports.

The United States gives even less attention to Eastern Europe. Exports and imports last year were about $275 million, or less than 1 per cent of all American trade.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 8, 1966]

FORD DISDAINS REDS' CAR DEAL

(By Robert W. Irvin)

DETROIT, October 7.—The Soviet Union, still trying to build a modern auto industry, has again approached the Ford Motor Co. for help, just as it did a generation ago.

But as it now stands Ford isn't interested in the new proposal outlined by the Russians.

The last time Ford helped the Russians set up some automobile plants it lost $500,000 in the process.

The latest proposal was made to Ford President Arjay Miller when he visited the Soviet Union last August. It is part of another Soviet effort to catch up with the rest of the industrialized world in production of passenger cars.

The Russians now produce in the neighborhood of 200,000 cars a year, about what the American auto industry can produce in one good week. A new five-year plan calls for quadrupling output by 1970.

To try to accomplish this, the Russians already have enlisted the help of Fiat of Italy and Renault of France.

For $320 million, the Italians will construct an auto plant on the Volga River. The first car will not roll off the assembly line until 1969 and the plant isn't expected to reach maximum production of 600,000 cars annually before 1972.

Renault has a contract to expand the Moskvich plant in Moscow, which is now capable of producing only 82,000 cars a year.

Ford's role, it was suggested by the Russians' could be in an advisory capacity.

It was understood Miller was sounded out on the possibility of Ford providing the Russians with the technical assistance and management know-how to set up a modern auto industry.

But company officials apparently don't believe it would be a worth-while endeavor on those terms.

Ford might be interested if it could get into the Soviet Union on a free market basis and sell its cars to the Russians in the same way that it sells automobiles in France and Germany.

But there is no basis now for believing the Russians would agree to this and so Ford is cool to the whole idea.

WASHINGTON POWER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on May 28, 1966, Mr. Clark R. Mollenhoff, of the Washington Bureau of Cowles Publications, Washington, D.C., spoke at Iowa Wesleyan College, Mount Pleasant, Iowa. The subject of his speech was "Washington Power—Your Responsibility."

In my opinion, Mr. Mollenhoff is one of the most able newspapermen in our country. He is a courageous and objective writer who recognizes that the constitutional guarantee of freedom of the press means that journalists have a corresponding trust of maintaining a free mind. One of the requirements of a free mind is possessing the ability to follow where the facts lead. Another requirement is possessing the ability to change one's mind when one discovers new facts that call for a modification of previously held views. Too many journalists do not possess these qualities, but Clark Mollenhoff does.

The speech that he delivered at Iowa Wesleyan College is a penetrating analysis of many of the policies of the Secretary of Defense and his associates in the Pentagon Building which have resulted in attempts on the part of the Pentagon Building to manage news involving military affairs. Mr. Mollenhoff is to be commended for his fearless journalism and his critical disclosures of policies of the Office of Secretary of Defense which he discussed in the speech he delivered at Iowa Wesleyan College.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Mollenhoff's speech inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

WASHINGTON POWER—YOUR RESPONSIBILITY

(By Clark R. Mollenhoff)

The war in Viet Nam must be a factor in your thinking and your planning. It is inevitable that it will be a major concern for you, for it can represent real and immediate problems for your career and your future. But while it is of vital importance, we must not forget about other related problems that are also vital to the whole future of our form of government.

All of us are caught up with the immediate, pressing problems of finding a job, making a living and in one way or another trying to make some worthwhile contributions to our community and our nation. It is easy for any of us to become so involved with the present, and with our own job or family to fail to take sufficient notice of bigger things that are of equally great importance to the long-time interest of ourselves or our families.

While the Viet Nam war has brought many problems to us as individuals and as a nation, it is possible that it will prove to be a blessing in disguise relative to the long range interest of the American Democracy. To our affluent and self-confident society the Viet Nam war may be the shock needed to make us face our responsibilities in the democratic society. A fat and contented society has been forced to take stock of itself and its strengths and weaknesses in the face of a real war. Suddenly, we have found more than 250,000 men in war in Viet Nam. Suddenly, we have faced the daily casualty list of young Americans—some very young and some with wives and children. Suddenly, the draft has become more than a slight possibility for young men graduating from high school and college. Suddenly, service in the Reserves or the National Guard has become more than a two-week cruise or a two-week camp in the summer. The war games are over and the grim possibility of personal tragic involvement is ahead for every family in which there are young men and boys.

The Viet Nam war has shocked us. It has made us reflect soberly about problems that have received too little attention. It has made us take stock of many things.

Viet Nam made us—

1. take stock of our commitments in all parts of the world under a wide range of treaties and sectional agreements;

2. take stock of the attitudes of allies and the neutralist nations that have been receiving more than $100 billion in foreign aid over a period of nearly 20 years;

3. take stock of how well prepared we are in terms of equipment and men, and in terms of the top management at the Pentagon; and

4. take stock of what the cold war, 20 years of Pentagon reorganizations, and a dozen years of $40 billion-a-year defense budgets have done to the system of checks and balances in our government and the whole nature of our society.

Even as you are thinking about the personal problems or family problems that arise in connection with the Viet Nam war, you should also think about some of these greater problems of Pentagon power and the future of our government. These are problems that will be with us long after the Viet Nam war is ended. They are problems that will be with us as long as there is a Cold war or a hot war and the need for financing and organizing a huge military machine for our protection against International Communism or any other foreign enemy.

There are questions of preparedness which have come to our attention that have given real cause for concern over the management of the Pentagon by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara:

1. McNamara opposed nuclear power for the aircraft carrier, the *John F. Kennedy*, and by using conventional power, built what the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy contends will be an obsolete ship within a few years.

2. McNamara opposed putting nuclear power in two rocket launching frigates, has indicated a general opposition to a nuclear-powered surface fleet. He is seeking to build destroyers with conventional power, over the objections of the House and Senate Armed Services Committees and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

3. McNamara overruled the top level Pentagon Source Selection Board's recommendation to buy the Boeing version of the TFX, and instead bought the General Dynamics plane which had been rated second in performance and higher priced by a minimum of $400 million.

4. McNamara disregarded the Army recommendations and cut the purchases of helicopters in 1964 and again in 1965, even after the value of helicopters in Viet Nam had become apparent and the need pressing.

5. McNamara decided to phase out the B–58 supersonic bombers without consulting the Joint Chiefs of Staff and against the judgment of the members of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees and the recommendations of General John McConnell, the Air Force Chief of Staff.

6. McNamara has refused to move forward with the Nike X antiballistic missile missile program despite recommendations from the Senate and House Armed Services Committees and the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

7. McNamara insisted, in July, 1965, that he had 16 Army divisions in 100 percent combat ready status and needing no equipment. In fact, one division was only 50 percent combat ready, some were only 75 to 80 percent combat ready, and there were significant shortages of a wide range of items including guns, radios and clothing.

8. McNamara defended the Army disposal of usable trucks and construction equipment after July, 1965, despite the fact that such equipment was badly needed in Viet Nam by the Navy, Army and Marines.

The reports of Senate and House Committees on these and other major problems raised serious questions about the effectiveness of the policies of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara—a man whose public image had been built to gigantic proportions through a huge propaganda campaign by the Pentagon press office.

Even though the controversies that swirl around McNamara are important, there are even more important issues that have developed in connection with the powers of the Defense Secretary's job that will be with us after he is gone.

If "power tends to corrupt," we should be filled with the greatest apprehension about the power of the Pentagon. Never in the history of our nation has so much power been centralized in the hands of so few men and subject to so few effective checks.

Periodically, an authoritarian trend becomes apparent in the comments or actions of a highly-placed civilian official or military officer. But such glimpses of the danger are fleeting, and few take the time to examine the evidence of the total power potential accumulated in the Office of Defense Secretary.

Viewed in its totality, the power centralized in the Office of Defense Secretary could be used to impose a dictatorship on the nation. There are still occasional challenges to the Office of Defense Secretary, but these challenges have appeared to be futile in most instances. Unless there are more effective challenges in the future, accompanied by courageous and persistent dissent, we may have passed the critical point and have already lost the battle against authoritarian government.

Many on the outside—not directly involved in the struggle with the Pentagon leadership—are not greatly concerned over the power centralization that has developed. At worst they regard it as a benevolent dictatorship that is probably necessary to command our military machine in days of space age warfare.

A different picture emerges for many of those who are directly involved in the struggle with the Office of Defense Secretary and who have tried to dissent. Defense contractors, congressmen, or high ranking military officers have been faced with actions they consider arbitrary, arrogant and ruthless.

Yet certain aspects of the Pentagon power are so subtle and so ubiquitous that its pervasiveness is received without any extended complaint. We accept it as the inevitable price we must pay for protecting our freedom from foreign enemies. The average citizen gives little thought to the dangers inherent in little reorganizations, little adjustments, little shifts of power which over a period of years have removed most of the effective checks on our huge military watchdog.

The enormity of the Pentagon power is not understood and the danger not recognized for a number of reasons. Predominant is the fact the daily press is reluctant to take on the job of criticizing those who control the major sources of news at the Pentagon. It is easy to submit to Pentagon news management pressures where the bait is an occasional exclusive story and comfortable, easy access to the "invitation only background news conferences" with top Pentagon spokesmen. Only a few of the Pentagon reporters will fight the system and risk the cold and uncooperative treatment handed out to those who are regarded as "unfriendly" or "unsympathetic" to the civilian power structure.

If the daily press does not show the way, magazine writers, columnists and television reporters have difficulty recognizing that a critical problem exists. The work of the courageous few is overwhelmed and inundated by the mass of stories flowing from sycophant journalists who picture the key Pentagon civilians as supermen.

As a result, the public is not confronted with the cold facts on Pentagon power, but finds them buried on the back pages while the glories of the heroic civilian bosses saturate the stories on page one.

The punishment of critical or "unfriendly" newsmen has served as an effective weapon to intimidate many bright and normally independent newsmen who must depend upon access to high Pentagon contacts for their livelihood. Defense Secretaries have initiated F.B.I. investigations of reporters for alleged breaches of national security when the stories embarrassed the administration, but the contentions of a security breach were highly questionable.

We assume that such Pentagon-inspired shadowing of reporters is unusual, but there

are other equally effective means of coercing newsmen or interfering with their contacts. There are efforts to ridicule the tough questioner. There have been efforts by the Defense Secretary to undermine the reporter with his superiors with vague and unsubstantiated charges of "irresponsibility."

Directives are issued which seriously interfere, with the freedom of action by any independent newsman. Such an order, written in October, 1962, directed that all civilian and military personnel at the Pentagon report before the end of each working day on all contacts with newsmen and the subjects discussed. That order is still in effect four years later despite press complaints that it was an obvious effort to pin down sources of unfavorable news stories and to eliminate this channel of dissent.

Effective efforts to discipline and control many in the Pentagon press corps have been used in other areas to coerce and control possible dissenters in the Congress, among the highest ranking military officers, and in the ranks of the major defense contractors. Through case studies it can be demonstrated how this control has been exercised through subtle as well as brutal methods.

Pentagon power has terrorized timid men who are fearful of being identified as dissenters. It has muffled the criticisms of brave men with position or family responsibilities that made it seem unwise to risk a career setback, loss of a defense contract, loss of a Pentagon research grant, or loss of a politically important military base. Few big business executives, military officers, members of Congress, or Governors are willing to risk the anger of the Secretary of Defense or his most influential assistants.

Even men with financial independence, courage and great prestige can be wary and apprehensive about risking a fight with the colossal multi-million-dollar propaganda machine that is the Pentagon press office. "You can't fight city hall," and today the realist must recognize that no city hall, no county courthouse, no state capitol has held one tenth of the coercive power now lodged in the Office of the Secretary of Defense through the power tentacles, that reach into the economics, the politics, and the communications network of the entire nation.

Observant individuals will see the manifestations of fear of the Pentagon power in many places:

A major defense contractor bent to that power when a key executive called a United States Senator to ask that there be no investigation of a decision which robbed his company of a billon-dollar contract. The firm was the low bidder, the product was evaluated as "superior," so there seemed every reason for the corporation executive to want the investigation. He believed his firm had been wronged by a political decision, but he was afraid to complain because he believed that the Office of Defense Secretary might be vindictive and cut the firm even more severely on future contract negotiations.

A Republican congressman declined to restate his criticism of the Defense Secretary in a Democratic administration, and said he feared retaliation in the form of the closing of a military base in his district. He did not feel that he could afford the political repercussions if an opponent hinted that a friendly Democrat could have saved the base and might obtain more defense contracts and other federal funds.

An admiral voiced private apprehension about his career because he simply answered questions for a Senate committee that revealed his opposition to a major decision by the Office of the Defense Secretary. His fears were realized and his Navy career was prematurely ended.

Two Senators with leading roles in critical investigations of a decision by the Defense Secretary found themselves subject to a series of attacks from anonymous Pentagon spokesmen unjustly charging them with base political motivations.

A Democratic lawmaker expressed frustration after the Office of Defense Secretary declined to make pertinent information available to his subcommittee, and later slapped a "secret" classification on a congressional report highly critical of the Defense Department management.

A distinguished military affairs writer found himself subject to private smears as "irresponsible" by the Office of Defense Secretary after publication of articles critical of military equipment shortages developing as a result of the Viet Nam war.

Of course, there is a general awareness of the tremendous military might embodied in a war machine that includes more than 2,500,000 people, ballistic missiles, a nuclear submarine fleet armed with Polaris missiles, and a Strategic Air Command armed with supersonic planes and the latest in nuclear weapons. And with this destructive power in mind, some political leaders issue periodic warnings of the danger of our military establishment falling into the hands of authoritarian minded, professional military men. Learned articles and exciting popular novels such as "Seven Days in May" are based on the theory that we must be alert to the danger of the military coups so commonplace in other nations.

Periodically, we are assured the great power of the Pentagon will not be misused by authoritarian-minded, professional military men because our civilian political appointees are guarding against any usurpation of power by the uniformed military hierarchy. Year by year, the civilian power of the Pentagon has been increased and centralized and nearly always on the theory that the authoritarian-minded and arrogant military brass is being put in its place by the democracy-minded civilians.

President Eisenhower left office warning of the danger of the military industrial complex in our society. Because he did not spell out the details, his remarks were interpreted widely as another warning of danger of a military or economic coup conducted by a coalition of our big industrial leaders and our uniformed military hierarchy. Some high-level political appointees used the Eisenhower comment as another authority to quote justifying more civilian action to remove power from the military men so it could be lodged in the hands of civilian political appointees.

While the warning finger was pointed at top ranking military officers, the political appointees pulled together the power over Pentagon decisions and centralized them in the Office of Defense Secretary. Few noted the consolidation of power even though the Congress continued to grind out annual studies on the "Economic Impact of Federal Procurement" that spelled out the facts and figures of strength lodged in the Pentagon budget.

Cold facts, in studies that were low key and dull, demonstrated that Defense spending, ranging from $40 billion to $60 billion a year, had tremendous political as well as economic impact on the biggest industries in the United States, on the most respected universities and colleges, and on the most influential political leaders. In fact, the more carefully the details of the Pentagon budget are studied, the more apparent it becomes that there are few institutions in our society—industrial, educational or political—not compelled to respect the power of the Pentagon decision makers.

A young man was elected to the United States Senate in a campaign claiming he could do more for Massachusetts because of his political connections in Washington. A large number of other Democratic candidates for the United State Senate and House tried to convey the impression that they, too, could be more successful than Republicans in intervening with the Pentagon.

The fear of possible political factors entering into Defense contract decisions is heightened when one examines statistics showing the overwhelming percentage of military contracts are awarded through the "negotiation" process. This eliminates protections afforded in standard competitive bidding and leaves the contractor at the mercy of the Pentagon negotiator.

In the period from 1951 through fiscal 1965, the Pentagon let contracts worth more than $357 billion. Only 13.7 percent of those contracts, covering $49 billion, were awarded through formally advertised bidding procurement procedures. The remaining $307 billion—a total of 86.3 percent—was handled through negotiated procurement.

Defense contracts are the life blood of many of the largest corporations in the United States, and the prosperity of a city, congressional district or state can be contingent upon the prosperity of the large corporations, their subsidiaries or their subcontractors. In the case of the large airplane manufacturers, the Defense contracts often make up the overwhelming majority of the total business load.

When the Boeing Company, headquartered in Seattle, Washington, lost the TFX warplane contract and had the Dyna-soar program ended it was a serious blow to the economy of the whole state of Washington.

The impact of military procurement actions was dramatically demonstrated in the state of Washington where military buying totaled $1,041,581,000 in fiscal 1963, increased slightly to $1,085,696,000 in fiscal 1964 and then plummeted to $545,607,000 in fiscal 1965.

The Boeing Company was low bidder for the multi-billion-dollar TFX warplane, but lost out to the Texas-based Convair division of the General Dynamics Corporation.

Significantly, military contracts awarded in Texas climbed steadily from $1,203,123,000 in fiscal 1963, to $1,294,431,000 in fiscal 1964 and on up to $1,446,769,000 in fiscal 1965.

Perhaps Pentagon attitudes toward important political figures from those states were not factors in the decline of Washington and the rise of Texas, but in the political atmosphere where candidates proudly boast that they can deliver the prosperity of big contracts it is dangerous to assume it is all idle boasting.

Whether rightly or wrongly, it has always been assumed that the political power of two Georgia legislators had a great deal to do with the unusual amount of Pentagon money that seemed to flow into that southern state. Large defense contractors seemed to have an affinity for the state represented by the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

Only California and Texas had more active duty military personnel than the 93,980 stationed in Georgia at the end of June, 1965. The annual payroll and allowances from this military payroll poured $396,437,000 into Georgia that year. In addition there were 33,563 civilian employees of the Defense Department in Georgia at that time with an estimated annual payroll of $223,527,000.

But the military bases were not the only Pentagon gifts to the home state of the two men who ran the Senate and House Armed Services Committees. The net value of military procurement action in Georgia was $423,290,000 in fiscal 1963, $520,169,000 in fiscal 1964 and a whopping $662,332,000 in fiscal 1965.

Lockheed Aircraft Corporation, with major plants in Georgia, was Number One in military prime contract awards in fiscal 1965 with $1.7 billion—approximately 7.1 percent of the total defense contracts in the United States.

The Pentagon decisions were a life and death matter to Lockheed, and the same was

true of General Dynamics Corporation which held the Number Two spot in military prime contract awards as a result of the huge TFX warplane decision. General Dynamics could boast of $1.1 billion in prime military contracts in fiscal 1965, followed by McDonnell Aircraft Corporation with $855 million; General Electric Company with $824 million; North American Aviation Company with $745 million; United Aircraft Corporation with $632 million; American Telephone & Telegraph Company with $587 million and the Boeing Company with $583 million.

Automotive giants, Ford and General Motors Corporations also had a share of Pentagon business worth protecting. Ford Motor Company and its Philco affiliate ranked twelfth with military prime contract awards totaling $312 million and General Motors had prime contract awards of $254 million in fiscal 1965. The Chrysler Corporation was far down the list with $80.9 million in fiscal 1965.

There were men in the communications industry who found it disturbing that two of the three major television networks had financial ties to major defense contractors. National Broadcasting Company is owned by Radio Corporation of America, a firm that was only 24 places down from the top among defense contractors in fiscal 1965 with $213,900,000. That same year, the American Broadcasting Company announced it was merging with International Telephone & Telegraph, a firm ranked 25th among defense contractors with $206,700,000 in prime military contracts.

It was obvious that a clever and power conscious political administration could use the Pentagon power over defense spending as a means of disciplining major television networks. Such an arrangement had obvious drawbacks in a nation so dependent on the networks for news and public service programs.

Several of the government-created, not-for-profit corporations ranked among the top 100 defense contractors on the net value of military prime contract awards. Aerospace Corporation was listed 48th with $77,500,000, System Development Corporation, 60th with $48,900,000 and Mitre Corporation, 70th with $38,500,000.

The big Pentagon budget has become a handy place for the nation's colleges and universities to find the answer to some of their pressing financial problems, and no doubt the Defense Department grants and contracts provide the means for paying higher salaries and buying better equipment. The arrangement raises long-range questions about how independent a Defense-subsidized academic community will be in analyzing or criticizing the programs or the policies of the men who control the flow of huge subsidies to higher education.

There is no doubt many of the largest universities have developed a big stake in retaining the cooperative relationship with the Pentagon that will result in renewal of contracts. In fiscal 1965, Johns Hopkins University was awarded $48,500,000 in military prime contracts and Stanford Research Institute had prime contracts totaling $30,700,000.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology rated the top position among recipients of Pentagon research and science education funds for fiscal 1964 with a total of $98,044,000. Johns Hopkins was second with $54,989,000 from Defense for research and science education, and the University of California was in third place with $19,068,000.

Even the $5,852,000 that Harvard received from the Pentagon in fiscal 1964 was substantial although the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation were government agencies making greater contributions to the total of $37,092,000 in federal funds Harvard received.

The importance of the impact of Pentagon money on American educational institutions was emphasized by the testimony of Defense Secretary McNamara on March 8, 1966. He told the House Armed Services Committee that "the Department of Defense supports nearly half of all the academic research in the physical sciences and engineering now being done in American universities and colleges." He said that much of the Pentagon money has been concentrated in larger schools, but McNamara revealed plans to broaden the base and bring most of the universities and colleges into the Pentagon orbit.

Many in the academic community may be unaware of the power Pentagon money could wield in the larger educational institutions, but in the Defense Department itself power and the centralization of that power in the Office of Defense Secretary is well understood.

Military and civilian payrolls demonstrate the importance of military bases to the economy and the politics of the various states. Also, there are few political leaders—from city hall to Congress—who do not understand the power potential in the Pentagon purse. The figures for June 30, 1965, show there were 1,041,244 active duty military personnel in the United States with total annual pay and allowances of $7.7 billion, while the Pentagon also had control over 940,763 civilian employees with a total annual pay of $6.7 billion. Military bases are a vital factor to all political leaders in a state such as California with 212,859 active duty military personnel and annual pay and allowances of $983,125,000 plus 138,777 civilian Defense Department employees with an annual payroll of more than $1 billion.

The same is true of Texas with 165,099 active duty military personnel drawing annual pay and allowances of $798 million plus 60,051 civilian Defense Department employees with annual pay of $398 million.

Even in a state such as Iowa, with only 1,445 active duty military personnel and 630 civilian Defense Department employees, political awareness of the Pentagon power over base closings is a necessity. The military payroll of $8 million and the civilian payroll of $3.7 million may be small in the overall economic picture of Iowa, but the closing of a base or an office can have important economic and political repercussions in the immediate area of the closing.

More important to Iowa would be any tampering with the hog market. We have even seen the Pentagon power used to try to control the price of pork in February, 1966. It was done by the simple device of an order cutting pork purchases for the military services.

In past years, power over military spending was widely scattered through the Defense Department as well as the military-aligned establishment in Congress. Highest ranking members of the Senate and House Armed Services and Appropriations committees were men who had a strong, and often dominant, influence over the Defense Department decisions. They were men whose views had to be considered most seriously in opening or closing bases, in awarding contracts, and in adopting general policy on weapons systems.

In that era of more diffused power, the Secretaries of Army, Navy and Air Force represented an independent force with considerable authority in spending Defense funds. That scattered power structure included many career military officers and civilian technical experts who could and did exert an important influence over the awarding of certain types of Defense contracts.

A gradual whittling away of the role of the Service Secretaries occurred over more than a dozen years, but the great change came after Defense Secretary McNamara took office in January, 1961. The former Ford executive used all powers granted by the reorganizations of 1947, 1949, 1953 and 1958 to pull more control into the Office of the Defense Secretary and away from the three Service Secretaries.

In the first year of the reign of Defense Secretary McNamara, civilian Service Secretaries bitterly resented what they considered an unlawful usurpation of power by the Office of Defense Secretary. If it was not McNamara personally, it was his Assistant Secretaries of Defense or the Deputy Assistant Secretaries of Defense who were actively bypassing the Service Secretaries to deal directly with almost all of the lower levels of authority. Army Secretary Elvis J. Stahr resigned in protest stating that "more and more, the decisions once made by the Service Secretaries and military chiefs, as individuals, are made by the Secretary of Defense and his staff."

The Army Secretary contended an unreasonable centralization was taking place, and said he did not believe that such a huge organization as the Pentagon could, or should, be run by a few people at the top. That view was similar to one expressed by Representative Carl Vinson, the veteran Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, a few years earlier in opposing too tight a centralization in the hands of a few men who he then believed could not possibly have the wisdom for all of the Defense decision making that would go with the centralization.

Chairman Vinson made a few futile attempts to oppose the authority of Defense Secretary McNamara, and then reconciled himself to a supporting role in a play in which he no longer held his old power. He found it convenient to become an almost fawning booster of McNamara as the "greatest Secretary of Defense in history."

Secretary of the Air Force Eugene Zuckert and Secretary of the Navy John Connally had some of the same early concern that Army Secretary Stahr expressed over McNamara's power play. Zuckert had a legal study made of his authority, and finally concluded the various reorganizations had, in fact, stripped the Service Secretaries of the power to effectively oppose the Defense Secretary. If they could not reconcile themselves to minor roles, resignation was the only practical alternative. Eventually Zuckert and Connally yielded their opposition to the Office of Defense Secretary and accepted a role which in fact made them subordinate to Assistant Secretaries of Defense in many important areas.

At the same time, the Joint Chiefs of Staff found their jurisdiction cut sharply by the same moves that had undercut the Service Secretaries. The Defense Secretary expanded his own office, established common service agencies for intelligence, supply and audit and the Assistant Defense Secretaries were permitted to wield an even broader authority in the various services.

The old patterns of military service alliances with United States Senators and Representatives tended to deteriorate and become an ineffective check on the Office of Defense Secretary. They could still exchange information, but it was often pointless. Senators and Representatives could no longer deal directly with the power of their friends in the bureaucratic hierarchy of the Army, Navy or Air Force to get things done. The Defense Secretary and his various Assistant Secretaries had become the final authority in matters that had been handled on a lower level.

The Defense Supply Agency and the Defense Intelligence Agency, created in the fall of 1961, provided Defense Department-wide services for purchasing common items and for gathering and evaluating intelligence information. The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs centralized information services to put a stop to the flow of information from the Army, Navy and Air Force not in tune with the plans and programs of the Secretary of Defense.

The Defense Contract Audit Agency was created in 1964 for the purpose of centralizing and improving audit of contracts. In

1965, it was revealed that the Defense Secretary planned that this audit agency should hire more auditors and accountants than the whole General Accounting Office (GAO) which was established by Congress to serve as a financial watchdog by post auditing all Government departments—including Defense.

Some of the GAO reports on Defense Department contracts had been so critical they caused resentment in the Office of the Defense Secretary. While Defense Secretary McNamara was establishing the new Defense Contract Audit Agency, his department was suggesting that GAO should tone down the criticism of Defense contracts, and that there should be a new evaluation of the role of GAO. This new evaluation was aimed at eliminating GAO access to some Defense Department records as well as Defense contractor records.

McNamara's office indicated that perhaps the GAO no longer needed to conduct the same type of audits at the Defense Department because of more thorough audits Defense was now conducting of its own activities. The Defense Secretary expressed the view that it would be "waste and duplication" for the GAO to come in and do the same type of audit on Defense that had been done in the past. The Defense Department paid little attention to a few complaints from Congress that there would be no objective audit if McNamara was permitted to control the audit of McNamara. It was one more step in the centralization of power and the elimination of outside checks.

The whole emphasis of the McNamara administration was centralization and more centralization with the Office of Defense Secretary expanding in size as well as in functions. The result was an end to the diffusion of power and creation of a centralized structure that put an aggressive and power conscious Defense Secretary beyond the checks and effective restraints that had existed in the past.

Five years of McNamara had fairly well completed the job:

1. The authority of the Service Secretaries was cut, and the possibility of effective or meaningful dissent from that source was minimized if not eliminated.

2. High ranking military officers had lost their tools for bargaining with Congress. They no longer had the protection of alliances with independent Service Secretaries and independent congressional leaders that had been necessary for them to be forcefully independent.

3. Congress found itself ineffective against the centralized power that had been pulled into the Office of Defense Secretary. A condition had been created in which they were more dependent upon the good will of the Defense Secretary than he was upon them.

A unified Congress might have the leverage to overrule a Defense Secretary, but the Congress is not unified. The Office of Defense Secretary had used its power over contracts and base closings to alternately pamper and coerce men of influence in the Senate and the House. Only a few Senators or Representatives with small political stakes in Pentagon decisions were willing to engage in open criticism of the Pentagon decision maker.

Even those who had the courage to criticize were fearful of the propaganda power of the Pentagon's centralized press office. The Pentagon press office spoke with one voice, and with a loud voice, in seeking to discredit critics in the Congress. The complex statistical data available in the multi-billion-dollar department was enough to confuse or overwhelm most critics as well as the press.

All this power was lodged in the hands of the Pentagon decision maker—Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

What this heavily centralized system lacks in the way of checks on the Pentagon power, it gains in the potential for efficiency under one-man rule of the multi-billion-dollar military machine. We are told that worries are groundless over what such centralized power might do to our system of government over an extended period of time. It is explained that those who wield the tremendous power with the broadest discretion are men of ability with a devotion to the duty of making the most effective and efficient war machine in history. If the methods seem a little brusque from time to time, it can be excused for the decision makers have heavy responsibilities and are intent upon creating bigger and better "cost effectiveness" tools for managing things for us. If we occasionally cannot understand their acts or their explanations, then we can just count ourselves as fortunate that patriotic and devoted men who understand everything have been willing to accept the responsibility for running our complex, power-laden Pentagon.

Initially the Department of Defense was created for the top level decision making. It was to be a small efficient organization, not bogged down in the day-to-day administrative problems of the Army, Navy and Air Force, and capable of making the big decisons and ironing out the squabbles.

For better or for worrse, the Pentagon has become the biggest and most centralized bureaucracy in the Free World. Four reorganizations, 20 years of Cold War and brush fire wars, and eight Defense Secretaries have molded a single-headed military power structure of massive proportions.

More awesome than his control over the actions of the military force is the power he holds over the spending of a budget of more than $50 billion a year. This is a power that can and does touch nearly every facet of our society, including the business and political community. It is a power that we have been warned should never be permitted to fall into the hands of any authoritarian minded military man, and there are even those who question the wisdom of concentrating such power in the hands of even the best motivated civilian Defense Secretary.

When it is viewed in its totality and in the perspective of history, it is obvious that there are reasons why the political power role of a Defense Secretary can be as terrifying to contemplate as is the military might. Whether it is used or not, the power over the Pentagon budget represents the power to coerce some of the biggest industries, some of the most respected educational institutions, some of the most influential columnists and authors and some of the most powerful members of the Senate and the House.

The fact that the Defense Department is big, complex and difficult to understand does not make the power less real. The naked power is only hidden—only camouflaged behind a curtain of polite language and mystifying statistical jargon that often seems designed to confuse rather than clarify.

There can be no doubt that the problem of Pentagon power is the overriding problem of our day. It will continue to be the major problem as long as there is the need for maintaining this huge war machine for our protection against foreign enemies.

Certainly, in today's world we could not consider eliminating or even seriously curbing our military might. It would be thoroughly unrealistic to consider placing our trust in the good faith of the Communist leaders or the agreements they may sign. Unfortunately, it will be necessary to continue to build and experiment and spend more billions for newer and more advanced weapons that we hope we will never be required to use. The fact poses these questions:

Are we, as a people, bright enough and deep enough to understand and control the power of our war machine?

Do we have an understanding of the need for dissent, criticism, and constant checks on this power?

Can we provide the mechanism to spread that power and control it so it will serve as a protection for a free society of free institutions?

Such attractive slogans as "increased efficiency" and "cost effectiveness" usually mask the moves to centralize power. Although these moves may be initiated in Washington, the responsibility for continuing centralization must be shared by every American citizen who fails to understand the ever present seeds of authoritarianism. That authoritarianism can make inroads only when our citizens are so careless, so short sighted and so lazy in their thinking that they permit centralized power to overwhelm free institutions.

Don't try to duck your responsibility.

Don't try to blame it on your Congressman or your Senator, because he hasn't given you sufficient warning of the problem. It is likely that he has warned you at several stages before giving up in frustration because you would not listen.

Don't try to blame your lack of information on your newspaper editor when you refused to read the long stories of explanation or the editorials. It is likely that he has given you many warnings on the dangers of centralized power before bowing to your preference for comics, gossip and superficial color.

Accept your responsibility for knowing the dangers of centralized power, of knowing the value of dissent and freedom. The future of our government depends upon you, and how you shoulder this responsibility. Your attitude and your actions will determine whether we are unusual people who know the value of freedom, or whether the United States of America will be remembered simply as an interesting experiment in self government that failed.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert D. Smith, Jr., of Arkansas, to be U.S. attorney, eastern district of Arkansas, for a term of 4 years (reappointment).

Charles M. Conway, of Arkansas, to be U.S. attorney, western district of Arkansas, for a term of 4 years (reappointment).

Edward A. Heslep, of California, to be U.S. marshal, northern district of California, for a 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 Tuesday, October 18, 1966, 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 hearings which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled for Tuesday, October 18, 1966, at 10:30 a.m., in

room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

Bryan Simpson, of Florida, to be U.S. circuit judge, fifth circuit, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

Charles R. Scott, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge, middle district of Florida, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

Fred J. Cassibry, of Louisiana, to be U.S. district judge, eastern district of Louisiana, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearings may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Edward D. Re, of New York, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States for the term of 3 years, from October 22, 1966 (reappointment).

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Tuesday, October 18, 1966, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

THIRTY-DAY LEAVE FOR MEMBER OF UNIFORMED SERVICE WHO VOLUNTARILY EXTENDS HIS TOUR OF DUTY IN A HOSTILE FIRE AREA

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair lays before the Senate H.R. 15748 which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 15748) to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize a special 30-day period of leave for a member of a uniformed service who voluntarily extends his tour of duty in a hostile fire area.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, this bill would provide that until June 30, 1968, members of the uniformed services who voluntary extend their tour of duty for at least 6 months in Vietnam will be entitled to a 30-day leave with the expense of transportation to be paid by the U.S. Government.

At the present time, the prescribed tour of duty is 12 months for service in Vietnam. At the conclusion of this period members are rotated out of this area. From the standpoint of overall effectiveness the 12-month tour is less than ideal. At the same time, the special conditions of warfare and the need for maintaining morale justifies in the opinion of our military commanders a limitation of 12 months on the tour of duty for an individual.

If a person should voluntarily choose to extend his tour of duty but desires to return to the United States prior to beginning his extension, his leave is chargeable as ordinary leave and he must travel on a space-available basis unless he should choose to return at his own expense. It is our understanding that space-available transportation at the present time is practically nonexistent.

This proposed legislation, therefore, would provide an incentive for individuals to voluntarily extend their tour of duty by granting them a period of 30 days' leave not chargeable to any other leave account with the leave to be spent at a selected location with transportation at Government expense.

Mr. President, the Department of Defense witness indicated that it is not anticipated that a large number would take advantage of this authority. At the same time, General Westmoreland has indicated that there are key specialists and others in critically needed positions who might choose to voluntarily extend their tour if this authority were granted. It is, of course, a great advantage to the military commander if he is able to retain for longer periods of time those who have acquired knowledge and experience in connection with the war in Vietnam.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to approve this bill as amended by the committee.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DODD. Is the bill open to amendment at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is one committee amendment, which the clerk will read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 2, line 10, after the word "title.", to insert:

The provisions of this subsection shall be effective only in the case of members who extend their required tours of duty on or before June 30, 1968.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, is the committee amendment before the Senate at the present time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the committee amendment is before the Senate at the present time.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I am opposed to the bill. I desire to speak against the bill, but I do not wish to address myself against the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 1, line 5, strike out "subsection" and insert in lieu thereof "subsections".

On page 2, line 1, after "action," insert "on or after the date of enactment of this subsection,".

On page 2, line 12, strike out the end quotation marks.

On page 2, after line 12, add the following:

"(c) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the case of any member or former member who, at any time during the six-month period immediately preceding the date of enactment of this subsection and while on active duty in an area described in section 310(a)(2) of title 37, United States Code, by reenlistment, extension of enlistment, or other voluntary action, extended his required tour of duty in that area for at least six months shall be paid for 30 days accrued leave. Such payment shall be in addition to any other pay to which such member or former member may be otherwise entitled. Any amount paid to a member or former member under this subsection shall be determined on the basis of the pay and allowance to which he was entitled on the date of his voluntary extension and shall be computed in the same manner as pay for accrued leave is computed under section 501 of title 37, United States Code. Payment for accrued leave under this subsection, in the case of a member or former member who is dead or dies before he receives such payment, shall be made upon application to the living survivor or survivors of such member or former member as prescribed in section 501(d) of title 37, United States Code."

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I have offered an amendment to H.R. 15748, the bill now before us which would grant members of our Armed Forces who reenlist for service in a hostile fire area 30 days of paid leave plus transportation to and from the United States.

As reported by the Armed Services Committee, H.R. 15748 would become effective the day it is signed into law and extend through June 30 of 1968.

My amendment would make the bill retroactive to 6 months prior to its enactment, thus extending these benefits to men who have reenlisted since May or June or who will be faced with this decision before the bill is signed into law.

The need for experienced, skilled personnel in Vietnam is critical. H.R. 15748 would help to meet this need by offering men whose tours of duty are about to end a greater incentive to reenlist for an additional 6 months.

There are many servicemen in southeast Asia who have already reenlisted without the inducement of a reward. It strikes me as unjust to ignore all of these men, for they have remained in this critical area out of a sense of responsibility, duty and patriotism. To reward only those who reenlist after the bill is enacted would be unfair and would place material motivation on a plane higher than true patriotism.

Imagine, for one thing, just how discouraging it would be to those few who must make a decision now to know they would not be eligible for these benefits whether they reenlist or not.

I believe that, in all fairness, an amendment such as the one I now offer should be approved.

While it would be desirable to reward all servicemen who have ever volunteered for additional Vietnam duty, the 6-month retroactive date was selected for practical reasons. It simply would not be administratively feasible to extend it for any greater period of time. Those who reenlisted in Vietnam more than 6 months ago have since completed this tour and are assigned to a new duty station or are back in U.S. civilian life. For this and other reasons the 6-month date seems to be the most reasonable cutoff point.

Since it would not be practical to interrupt the remaining duty time for these particular men, another form of benefit must be substituted for the 30-day leave prescribed in H.R. 15748.

The most sensible and equitable substitute would be an added 30 days' pay at the salary level of the individual eligible for these benefits.

Under this proposal, these servicemen would not benefit as much as those who reenlist after enactment of H.R. 15748, but, all things considered, it would seem to be the best solution.

In those tragic cases of men who have lost their lives while fulfilling a 6-month reenlistment tour in Vietnam, 30 days' additional pay would be provided his widow, children, or dependent parents.

I hope that the Senate will act today to offer our military personnel in Vietnam an incentive to extend their tour, and, in so doing, will also recognize those dedicated and unselfish men who have already made this great personal sacrifice without promise of reward.

Mr. President, it seems to me to be a reasonable, humane, and sensible amendment. A member of the armed services may have reenlisted voluntarily, out of sheer patriotism, but, because of the time it takes for such a bill to go through the legislative machinery, until the President signs it, he is ineligible. It could have happened last week. It does not seem fair to me.

I offer this amendment in all earnestness. The need for experienced, skilled personnel in Vietnam is critical, as we all know. H.R. 15748 would help to meet that need, and I am for it.

But there are many servicemen in southeast Asia, and perhaps in other hostile fire areas, who have already reenlisted without this inducement or reward. I repeat that it strikes me as being unjust to ignore all those men. I know we cannot go all the way back. It would seem to me to be obviously administratively impossible to do that. We can go back a reasonable time, and we can certainly include those who, in recent months, on their own, without any inducement of 30 days' pay, but because they wished to serve their country in great danger and great hardship, reenlisted. I say that they should not be excluded from the benefits of the bill we are considering today.

I say that to reward only those who reenlist after the bill is enacted would place material motivation on a plane higher than patriotism. Imagine how discouraging it must be to those few who must make a decision now—by now I mean today or in the next few days, before the bill could be enacted—to know that they will not be eligible for these benefits whether they reenlist or not.

It seems to me that this is a fair amendment. Let me add that while I think it would be desirable to reward all servicemen who have volunteered for additional duty, the 6-month retroactive date was selected, as I have pointed out, for practical reasons. The most sensible and equitable substitute would be an added 30 days' pay at the salary level of the individual eligible for those benefits. It would not be combat pay; it would be just his regular pay. Under this proposal, those servicemen would not benefit as much as those who would reenlist after the enactment of this bill. They will not get the same benefit; they will just get 30 days' additional pay, and that is all. I think we ought to do something for these people who have, on their own, volunteered to stay over there, in perhaps the most difficult place in the world, to wage a war in the jungles, suffering day after day, not permitted any of the normal leave that other soldiers receive. And in those tragic cases, Mr. President, of men who have lost their lives while fulfilling a 6-month reenlistment tour, under my amendment 30 days' pay would go to the widow or children or dependent parents.

I think it is not only a humane thing to do, I think it is an entirely sensible thing to do. As the bill stands now, it puts a premium on the material value of reenlistment, and ignores all those brave men who have reenlisted on their own, without any such inducement. I think it is little enough. I do not know how many are involved. A member of my staff talked to the Pentagon, but could not obtain a figure. They said there was no technical objection to my amendment. I suppose they may not like it because it may burden them with some slight amount of additional administrative work.

But I do not know how I can face or any of us can face the family of a boy who reenlisted, say, 10 days ago, when they ask, "Why did he not get the additional pay or the breaks you are giving those who reenlisted after the bill was signed?"

I do not know how to answer them. I do not think anyone else could answer them. It is not any answer, to me, to say it was a practical matter. It is an easy thing to do what my amendment would do—we have done it many times heretofore—to show them that we appreciate what they did without the inducement of money and a free trip home.

That is the whole purpose of my amendment. I hope that the distinguished Senator from Nevada will accept it. I do not know whether he can or not, but I wish he would.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I regretfully must say that I cannot accept the amendment on behalf of the committee. Furthermore, the Department of Defense has advised me that they are opposed to the amendment.

With respect to one question the Senator posed, as to the families of the men who have already reenlisted, who might ask why they did not get the additional pay, the answer is very simple: Because the bill does not provide for additional pay. No one receives any additional pay under the bill as reported. That provision is part of the Senator's amendment, which is where the so-called additional pay comes in; and we also are opposed to that provision.

Traditionally, in the service, a man may accrue leave, for which he can be paid on separation. He cannot accrue more than 60 days' leave at one time. Such leave is frequently accrued, and when the men are separated from the service, they receive payment therefor.

In addition, the Senate has provided on previous occasions incentives for the people serving in Vietnam. For example, we passed a bill for hostile fire pay, providing that they could be paid additional compensation for service under such circumstances. We passed a Federal income tax exemption for enlisted men serving in Vietnam. We provided an additional exemption of about $200 a month for officers serving there.

So it is not correct to maintain that we have not given them any incentives. This proposal is simply a proposal to induce more people to reenlist in the specialist areas General Westmoreland has referred to, where the need is especially great, and some added incentive is needed. This is an incentive for future reenlistments, not for reenlistments which have occurred in the past. If a man has had his leave, and reenlisted, he is not in a position to take additional leave in the future. This bill would simply provide that if he does reenlist, he could take a 30-day leave which would not be charged to his normal leave, and could come to the United States, if he so desired, on other than a space-available

basis, and then return to the area of conflict.

I say, with due respect to the Senator, that if I felt his amendment had merit, if the committee felt it had merit, and if the Department of Defense felt it had merit, we certainly would have no objection to supporting it. But for the reasons I have stated, I cannot support the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, and would have to urge the Senate to reject it.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, may I make a brief response?

It seems to me that the crux of the issue before us is this: Under the bill, the man who reenlists after its signing gets a free trip home, besides the additional pay. All I am asking is that those who have reenlisted recently receive, not the free trip home—they are going to stay there in combat—but only that they receive the regular additional pay, for a 30-day period. I cannot see the unreasonableness of it, and I think it is a mistake to exclude them.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is amazing to me that we should even seriously consider an amendment of this sort. I am, of course, definitely opposed to the amendment, together with other members of the Armed Services Committee including the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], who is managing the bill.

Senator CANNON and I were, of course, present at the the Armed Services Committee hearing on this bill. Only one witness, Gen. William Berg of the Department of Defense, testified. Following his testimony the distinguished chairman of our committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] questioned him.

Senator RUSSELL asked him:

You mean a man flying an airplane off a carrier is not considered in hostile fire?

Somewhat to our surprise, it turned out that such an individual would not benefit from this bill. The amendment contrary to what was said by the author, who is not a member of the Armed Services Committee, does not grant to all servicemen this added pay. As the distinguished Senator from Nevada has said, we have already been very fair to our combat troops in Vietnam. They are the beneficiaries of hostile fire pay, and they have the income tax exemption, as he stated.

After General Berg responded to Chairman RUSSELL'S question, he was told:

So, he would not benefit from this bill.

General Berg replied:

That is correct.

Chairman RUSSELL then stated:

But a man serving on the ground, in the ground forces of the Air Force up in Thailand, would be included.

To our surprise, General Berg said:

Not in Thailand, because that is not a hostile fire area, sir.

Yet, practically all the airplanes that fly from our airbases in Thailand bomb installations in North Vietnam, and many of our pilots from Thailand are shot down.

Mr. President, I am going to argue later against the passage of the bill in the form in which it was reported from the Armed Services Committee. I was in the minority on that committee, but I am knowledgeable as to the contents of the pending bill.

It is apparent that the author of the amendment lacks knowledge as to who would and who would not benefit from the bill.

There is no precedent for the bill in its present form. Chairman RUSSELL has expressed himself on the RECORD as having misgivings about the bill.

The distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], a member of the Committee on Armed Services, referred in our committee to the ice cream men—the men working in PX's and commissaries—and the headquarters men, and to the fact that they would be the real beneficiaries of the pending bill, but that helicopter pilots in Thailand, and pilots flying from Thailand would not benefit whatever.

Responding to a question by Chairman RUSSELL regarding the fact that our pilots flying missions over Vietnam from our bases in Thailand are not covered by the proposed bill, General Berg stated:

Those people do receive hostile fire pay.

Chairman RUSSELL then said:

Well, how about a man that is working in an office in Saigon?

General Berg replied:

Any person who is stationed in Vietnam or in the waters within a 12-mile limit, I think it is, where the tour is precisely one year, would be covered by this bill.

Without a doubt, the officers and enlisted men stationed in our air-conditioned headquarters in Saigon would be the real beneficiaries of this bill. They would like to retain the continuity of the office personnel there.

General Berg stated that only our personnel stationed in Vietnam or in the waters, within a 12-mile limit, would be covered by the bill.

In the hearings, Chairman RUSSELL said:

Unfortunately, a large percentage of the 400,000 people we have over there are not engaged in combat at any time, and they will benefit by this just as much as the man who stays up there in the rice paddy, getting shot at all day. But as I say, we have never been able to get the Department of Defense to undertake to define a combat troop, a combat soldier. They say they cannot. We will have to take it as it is.

In the course of the hearings, Chairman RUSSELL also said:

Well, it is a mighty bad bill. It is worse than I thought. . . .

Mr. President, that statement was made by the distinguished and respected chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate at a hearing in which the Armed Services Committee was considering this matter. He said:

It is a mighty bad bill. It is worse than I thought.

Mr. President, I am not going to speak at any length on the bill itself at the present time, but as soon as the pending amendment is disposed of, I intend to express my views regarding the bill.

This is a bill concerning which our distinguished chairman expressed some doubts and misgivings. I consider it to be a very bad bill and I intend to speak and vote against it.

I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut would make it a worse bill. I join with the manager of the bill, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] in urging that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the argument of the Senator from Ohio seems to be that the pending bill is a bad bill.

I have listened to his reading of the record and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] was saying, it seems to me, that the bill should have included those people in Thailand.

That would make sense to me. I am not a member of the committee. I do not know the ins and outs, but one does not have to be a member of the committee to sense the humane element in the amendment I offer. That is the purpose in offering it.

Mr. President, I am ready to have a voice vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was rejected.

U.S. ARMED FORCES IN THAILAND

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on September 27, the Foreign Minister of Thailand, Thanat Khoman, spoke to the General Assembly of the United Nations. His speech, like those of other spokesmen for some of the small countries of Asia—the Philippines, South Vietnam, Taiwan—reviewed the importance to them of U.S. protection against their present and potential enemies. Mr. Thanat sought to wrap himself in the cloak of freedom, although he and his government do not represent freedom in their own land.

The junta that rules Thailand today destroyed constitutional government in that country in 1958, when they overthrew it by military coup. Its Foreign Minister speaks piously now of "freedom-loving peoples," as though his government had brought freedom to someone, or had safeguarded it for the people of Thailand. There have been no elections there since 1957, the year before the present Government suspended the constitution.

Mr. Thanat has no credentials to speak for freedom at all. The most he can show is that the Thai Government today is non-Communist. That goes a long way in Washington these days, especially among small Asian countries. So far, Thailand is not Communist. But indications are that with our help, the Government Mr. Thanat speaks for is introducing into Thailand all the elements that made Communist gains possible in South Vietnam.

THAI NEED FOR SECRECY

Communism has bred and thrived in Asian countries governed the way Thai-

land is governed—by a clique which enjoys financial prosperity at the expense of large numbers of its people, and made possible by profitable arrangements with a western nation.

Mr. Thanat told the General Assembly:

> The intransigence of the aggressors has in no small measure been encouraged and even enhanced by the lack of unity and by dissenting opinions of small and misguided minorities in various countries. These dissenting minorities, consisting of elements from legislative quarters, from the press, the church and from the uninformed academic circles, are least familiar with and even ignorant of the true facts of the situation, but allow themselves nevertheless to be carried away by their abstract and unrealistic constructions, or by their belief in false liberalism, to voice suggestions and opinions which benefit and give comfort to no one except the enemies of freedom and liberty.

I do not expect Mr. Thanat to understand, much less to appreciate, the debate on foreign policy which has gone on in a small way in the United States Senate. The Thai government has no time for such institutions as the check and balance system or any kind of division of powers and responsibilities, such as characterize our constitutional system of government. It came to power by deposing established institutions of that kind, just as they were beginning to take hold in Thailand. Half of the National Assembly had been chosen in 1957 by popular vote for the first time, when it was eliminated by military coup d'etat.

Thailand's foreign and domestic policies are not put to any more tests of popular support, and if legislative quarters, the press, the church, and academic circles in Thailand or the United States are uninformed, it is because the government in Thailand does not want them to be informed.

Why not? Why does Mr. Thanat's government draw an iron curtain of secrecy around the military arrangements and financial arrangements it has made with the United States, and then argue that all inquiries and objections from legislative quarters are the result of ignorance?

If his case is so convincing, why does he not want it discussed publicly by the American Senate and its Foreign Relations Committee?

And why are these demands of the Thai government for secrecy in its dealings with the United States accepted by the American Government, even at the sacrifice of our American constitutional principles?

The administration rejected the request of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to discuss with us in open meeting the nature and purpose of the American involvement in Thailand. It is understood that this response was in deference to Thailand. It is my own opinion that the forthcoming election also had a lot to do with reluctance of the administration to discuss the nature and extent of our buildup in Thailand, for it already exceeds the extent of our buildup in Vietnam prior to the election of 1964. The Congress and the American people were given little indication of what we had been committed to there, either, prior to the 1964 election.

This time, the Foreign Relations Committee has done its best not to let that happen again, and to fulfill our constitutional duty to participate with the executive in the fixing of foreign policy objectives and methods. That duty is one of the reasons for the existence of the Senate. This body was created with special powers and qualifications to serve as a counsel to the President, particularly in international affairs. That is why treaties must be ratified by two-thirds vote of the Senate, and why it must confirm the appointment of ambassadors.

It was expected that the commitments of the American people would be made in treaty form. Today, that is almost a dead letter.

Too many in the Congress of the United States have abdicated their constitutional responsibilities to check an executive branch of Government.

I say to the American people: It is your responsibility and your fault. Do not pass the buck to the Congress of the United States, for you elected its Members. So long as you are willing to elect men and women who are willing to abdicate their constitutional responsibilities, then you have only yourselves to blame for this trend toward government by executive supremacy. If you permit it to become a reality in full, then you will have lost your freedom.

The operative treaty in this area of the world, SEATO, commits us to consult with certain nations in cases of insurgency and to act in accordance with our constitutional principles to meet a common danger from armed attack. That is all it commits us to, Dean Rusk to the contrary notwithstanding. What we are doing in Thailand is not consulting about an insurgency. But no "common danger" has been found by SEATO; neither have the constitutional processes of our Constitution to act under that paragraph been met, and our current actions have not been reported to the Security Council of the United Nations, as they must be when we act under this commitment through the United Nations Charter.

The creeping escalation in Vietnam and the secret buildup in Thailand tell us how far we have moved away from the principle that such undertakings of the United States, such commitments of the blood and wealth of the American people, could be entered into only upon the advice and consent of the Senate. Not only do the American people no longer know what is being done in their name and in the name of future generations, but the Congress and the Senate do not know, either.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] accurately referred on Monday of last week to an American effort to change the face of Asia by executive fiat. Executive fiat is what Mr. Thanat likes and understands best, because it is by executive fiat that his dictatorial government governs. It has no time for checks, balances, questions, or debate from a legislature responsible to the people, a legislature which must raise the armies and the money to pay for a program undertaken by executive fiat. The first thing the military junta Mr. Thanat represents did when it seized power was to get rid of a legislature that was then only even partly independent.

In Thailand, the money to pay for its programs comes from the United States, or is raised at home by executive fiat, too.

U.S. FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF THAILAND

A few sentences later, the Thai Foreign Minister spoke of "Others still who are far away and in the midst of their opulence and comfort seem also to be seized with griping apprehension that events in Vietnam may adversely affect their present abundant and luxurious living by dragging them into the spreading conflict."

As one who has gone over the foreign aid presentations year after year in the Foreign Relations Committee, I can say that few countries exceed Thailand in the glowing picture presented of their prosperity while at the same time their grant economic aid from the United States has gone up year after year. We are told every year that it has a high rate of landownership by farmers, and that it has a good rate of economic growth. These optimistic reports are promptly contradicted in the foreign aid presentations by the information that one-third of the entire population living in the Northeast of Thailand does not share in the general prosperity, is remote, neglected, and consequently subject to Communist guerrilla activity that requires large sums of American money to combat.

A reasonable question arises of why it has been necessary for the United States to expand an economic grant program in a country that is supposed to be as well off as Thailand. Currently, U.S. economic aid to Thailand is about 70 percent grant money. This very high level of supporting assistance is, of course, justified in the U.S. on the ground that it is spent to curb or head off insurgency in the northeast and extreme south of the country.

Every report that comes to me does not suggest that life in Thailand, particularly Bangkok, has become Spartan or that any belt-tightening among the Thais has occurred in an effort to combat its own insurgency problem or to contribute to the war in Vietnam. To the contrary, American aid has taken care of these costs for the military junta running the government of Thailand. As has been true in Korea, Taiwan, South Vietnam, and the Philippines, the efforts of Thailand to counter any Communist threat, internal or external, has largely been financed by the United States, not by the opulent and comfortable among their own people.

I wish it were possible for me to tell the Senate, the American people, and the Thai people, too, of all the American money now going into Thailand by way of economic aid, military aid, and the expenditures of the Defense Department for our bases and forces. The economic aid last year was about $40 million and $60 million this year. But the military aid information has to remain secret. I want to repeat that, Mr. President, for that sentence is a sentence that the American people should take note of: But

the military aid information has to remain secret. That is in keeping with the requisites of the Thai Government. It is enough to say that the United States is paying a very high price to Thailand for the use of her territory.

The American people will subsequently be introduced, after the fact, to commitments which, in my opinion, are not in the security interests of this Republic and never should have been made in the first place.

Much of the whole foreign aid program is for the purpose of implementing those commitments. Nothing in it should be kept from the American people, for it will be the American people who pay the bill and who will die by the millions if the foreign policy course of action of this administration is not checked; and it should be checked here in the Congress.

U.S. PRESENCE MAKES THAILAND A TARGET FOR SUBVERSION

More important is the relationship to our American military activities of the guerrilla activities in northeast Thailand. There does not seem to have been an insurgency problem there until after we sent 5,000 troops into the area in 1962. The reports of "terrorism" and guerrilla insurgency began about 1964 and 1965, when plans for large-scale American bases were well underway. There is no evidence that this U.S. buildup was designed to counter an internal threat to Thailand. On the contrary, the internal threat has come after Thailand offered herself as an outpost of the Pentagon building in Asia.

A column on Thailand by William Ryan of the Associated Press appeared in the Eugene, Oreg., Register-Guard on September 29, and I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Ryan notes in his articles:

Thailand's role in the Vietnam war, as the site of bases whence United States planes take off, probably has made the country even more an attractive target for subversion and guerrilla tactics inspired and supported by the Red Chinese. . . .

There is little secret about the use of Thai bases in the Vietnam war. As long ago as January, the Associated Press reported from Saigon that probably 60 percent of air strikes against North Vietnam were taking off from Thai bases. With the U-Tapao base now available, the percentage seems bound to rise. It should be far easier for B–52 bombers to reach North Vietnam from there than from Guam.

At the enormous Sattahip naval base complex, 100 miles south of Bangkok, Americans are building a complete major port at a cost of about $90 million. When it is completed within two years, it will have deep water berths, rock breakwaters, new fuel storage tanks, pipeline supply systems, improved port installations, ordnance depots, table communications and supporting facilities.

In addition, new roads with military meaning are being built in the country and existing transport routes are being upgraded. . .

Mr. Ryan later notes that in addition to these direct expenditures on capital improvements, U.S. economic aid to Thailand in 1965 amounted to $43 million, with an additional unspecified amount of military aid. The economic aid figure this year is over $60 million. So Thailand has been well rewarded financially for this U.S. military presence.

Let me point out to the American people that they have not been given the facts about the economic aid either. Let me point out to the American people that this administration will not permit the release of the investigations of the Comptroller General of this country and the expenditure of American aid money in Thailand, and that is not because of any request of the Comptroller General. He is perfectly willing to have those reports released. He is perfectly willing to have the label "secret" and "confidential" taken off of those reports. This administration does not dare to take them off, any more than it dares to take those labels off the other reports dealing with the shocking waste, inefficiency, and the cause of graft and corruption of American foreign aid in many parts of the world found by the Comptroller General in his investigations.

I want to say to the people of this country that if they are interested in their own self-interest they should resent the secrecy of this administration and insist that the people be given the facts.

But it is a sad fact that the American military presence in Thailand has made that country a target for subversion. This means that we also have a responsibility to protect and defend this undemocratic government, no matter how serious the insurgency becomes, no matter how unpopular it may be with its own people, and no matter whether the opposition is Communist or non-Communist.

This is how we tied ourselves to Diem in South Vietnam, and ultimately felt we had to carry on a war there. Likewise, we have intruded ourselves into Thailand to the extent that we have a "face" there that we will be told we must save at any cost.

U THANT HAS BEEN THWARTED BY MANY NATIONS, INCLUDING THAILAND

Elsewhere in his speech, Mr. Thanat said of the forthcoming retirement of the Secretary General:

Another reason which prompted the Secretary-General to decline accepting further his present difficult assignment is said to be lack of cooperation on the part of certain nations to solve a number of international problems, among which figures prominently that of the war in Vietnam. There again, we who live in Southeast Asia fully understand and appreciate the disappointment and frustration felt by an international official whose primary duty it is to help bring international conflicts to an end and to develop and promote peaceful conditions in the world. For in spite of his desire to discharge conscientiously the responsibility of his office, the Secretary-General, more often than not, has had to face non-cooperation and even completely negative and obstructive attitudes from those who seek to extend their domination and further to expand their influence and control over others. That explains why, on more than one occasion, the Secretary-General has had to adopt a totally despondent posture and confess to the world at large that much as he realizes that it is his duty to help resolve the present acute problem of the war in Vietnam, neither the organization which is entrusted with the function of preserving and maintaining peace nor he himself who is its chief executive, can do much, if anything at all, to carry out their peace mission.

I wonder whether Mr. Thanat said this in full knowledge of U Thant's 3-step proposal for negotiations, the first of which is that we stop bombing North Vietnam. In any case, one of the chief points Thanat makes in his address is that the bombing should not stop.

The United States and Thailand have, by their joint bombing raids, contributed full share to the difficulties faced by the Secretary General in seeking to bring peace to southeast Asia. As I have mentioned, we expanded the war by using Thai bases as our privileged sanctuary, and Thailand expanded it by permitting us to do it. Neither country has reported these measures to the Security Council of the United Nations, as we are obliged to do if we are acting to meet a common danger from armed attack under the Southeast Asia Defense Treaty.

Let me say for the benefit of Secretary of State Rusk that the so-called informal conversations or backstage conversations by the American Ambassador in the United Nations do not meet the obligation under SEATO to report to the Security Council; for we have an obligation to file formal reports setting forth the facts concerning our activities, and that the United States does not dare to do. The United States does not intend to tell the world what it is doing in secret in many parts of the world to increase the great danger toward more conflict instead of less conflict. Thailand is a good example.

The bombing of North Vietnam by the U.S. planes out of Thai bases was resumed early this year at the same time we asked the Security Council to deal with the threat to peace in Vietnam.

That was a face-saving resolution on the part of the administration. The heat was too hot for the Johnson administration not at least to make some gesture toward the Security Council. So it did file a resolution, but has not carried out its responsibilities by insisting upon action on the resolution. That is why I have been saying in recent days in the Senate and across the country—and I shall continue to say it, Mr. President—that the President is going in the wrong direction when he goes to Manila. The President should go to New York City. The President should appear first before the Security Council and then before the General Assembly. The President should talk to the world as the representative of a signatory to the United Nations Charter and call upon the United Nations to carry out the primary obligation of every signatory to that Charter—that is, meet in joint action to enforce a peace where there is a threat to the peace anywhere in the world.

That is where my President should do his talking, rather than in Manila in a conference composed for the most part of those who were in collusion and threatening the peace of the world in Asia, many of them having become our vassal states completely dependent upon the American taxpayers for the payment of their international military operations.

The technique of making the war bigger as we ask someone else to stop it has characterized our policy in southeast Asia. The New York Times of October 7 had editorial criticism of this practice, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MORSE. The editorial states in part:

Can the United States steadily escalate the war in Vietnam, prepare for a still bigger war next year, and at the same time bring about peace negotiations with Hanoi? Peace offers with one hand; killing, burning, defoliating, destroying, bombing with the other. The result, surely, is to cancel out each other's effectiveness. . . . Yet, this past week the United States showed that it could call a halt where it wanted when the bombing of a corner of the demilitarized zone between North and South Vietnam was stopped. It could be stopped in all of North Vietnam. Talk of peace plus acts of war will not add up to a negotiated settlement. The old adage that "actions speak louder than words" applies in Vietnam today as it has at all times and everywhere.

I want to commend the editors of the New York Times once again because during the past 3 years, as this historic debate has continued in the Senate, with a small number of us protesting American policies in southeast Asia, the New York Times has published editorials which support the general position we have taken, just as this editorial backs up the position that I, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] have taken in regard to the escalating war policy of the United States in southeast Asia.

Mr. Thanat roundly castigates the proposal that the bombing be stopped.

The proposal has come from a prominent dissenting legislative quarter of the Senate, the chairman of our Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. It has also come from the Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant. Mr. Thanat of Thailand deplores the idea, but he also deplores the failure of nations to cooperate with the Secretary General in his quest for negotiations that will stop the war.

He might well start with Thailand and the United States in this respect, for it is our two countries that have forestalled what U Thant considers the first step toward peace negotiations.

With the possible exception of the Soviet Union, no nation or combination of nations in the United Nations is able to cope with the B–52's and other fighters and bombers of the American Air Force, except with American cooperation. So long as they bomb on our command, there there is nothing the United Nations can do to stop them. That, too, is one of the frustrations of U Thant—one of the major ones, not only for him but also for the whole United Nations.

THAILAND URGES BOMBING TO CONTINUE

It comes with poor grace from the Foreign Minister of Thailand to speak first of the roadblocks nations have put in the way of peace, and then to demand a continuation of the bombing. He told the General Assembly:

Some have suggested that in order to end the war in Vietnam there should be unilateral cessation of aerial attacks on North Vietnam. In this connection, they all seem to have forgotten that bombing has been halted at least twice, the first time for five days and the second time for more than a month. In both cases, the cessation of bombing yielded no worthwhile results. On the contrary, it gave undue advantage to the other side which made use of the lull to gather more strength, with which to intensify and escalate the conflict.

Since the one contribution of Thailand to the war has been the use of its territory for our air bases, and for which we have stepped up our aid program and our capital investment in that country, it is no surprise that Mr. Thanat wants the raids to continue.

The air attacks on the North began early in 1965. At that time, the so-called invasion from the north was a trickle of men and supplies. Today, after a year and a half of bombing at a rate exceeding the monthly tonnage dropped on all of Europe in World War II, and in Korea, the rate of infiltration has still grown. On August 21, the New York Times reported from Thailand:

United States sources say the North Vietnamese have succeeded in greatly enlarging and improving the so-called Ho Chi Minh trail through Laos to South Vietnam in the last 18 months. Despite daily American air strikes, the sources declared, the North Vietnamese have been able to turn a web of what were once simple tracks or paths into a complex of dirt roads over which their Soviet-made supply trucks can move.

When I make reference to those statistics, Mr. President, I am using statistics of the administration. I am pointing out the testimony of Pentagon witnesses, including the Secretary of Defense, who has testified that we are dropping more tons of bombs per month in the war in Vietnam than we dropped per month on all of Europe and Africa during World War II.

This is no brush fire that we are fighting. The United States has made it a major war.

Our casualties month by month are beginning to show how major it is. The cost of $2,700 million a month to the American taxpayers also shows how major it is.

I take Senators to the testimony of the Secretary of Defense prior to the beginning of the bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong. His testimony in January 1966, in reply to questions put to him by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], before we even started the bombing, was that the bombing would have little effect upon what assistance the North Vietnamese were giving the Vietcong.

What is being pointed out now by authority after authority, by correspondent after correspondent, is that the bombing of Hanoi has only intensified their determination to continue the war.

We may eventually be able to bomb them to a surrender table, but we will never bomb them to a peace table. What the American people had better recognize, before it is too late, is the difference between a surrender table and a peace table. We had better recognize, before it is too late, that for future generations of American boys and girls, not only for decades, but for centuries to come, the Asian people will have great resentment toward Americans.

Mr. President, we have lost our mind. We have lost our judgment. We cannot do this on a unilateral basis. We must proceed, as I have pleaded on the floor of the Senate, as have the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and other Senators, on a multilateral basis to have a peace table set up—not with the United States at the head of that table. We have lost our right to sit at the head of the table. That table must be a tripartite table, a three-sided table, the United States and South Vietnam on one side, the Vietcong, the North Vietnamese, and probably the Red Chinese on the other side, and the noncombatant nations conducting the negotiations, and "calling the shots," so to speak, for every nation in the world has a vital interest in a peaceful solution of the American war in southeast Asia.

On August 10, the Times had also reported that the infiltration rate had increased despite these raids:

Neither increasing bombing of the North nor stepped-up American "spoiling attacks" on guerrilla bases in the South has appeared to reduce the enemy's ability to build up his forces in response to American increases.

In fact, these forces are being increased. Week by week, by the thousands, there are desertions from the South Vietnamese forces and recruitment of Vietcong in South Vietnam. We are getting information that has filtered through that the tyrant we are keeping in power, Ky—who never fought the French, but fought with them—is not going to resort to capital punishment against desertions. What a confession of the failure of the South Vietnamese military establishment. The latest figures furnished to us in the Foreign Relations Committee were that they are having desertions on the basis of 90,000 a month.

I do not know how long this administration can keep the American people in darkness, as to what we are really doing in southeast Asia.

I full well understand my course of action; but I intend to keep the trust, and I do not intend to vote to kill American boys in an undeclared war.

Let the administration come forward with a recommendation of a declaration of war. Once again, I repeat, it does not dare recommend a declaration of war. The reason why it does not dare to recommend a declaration of war is that it would stand isolated around the world.

In examination of our Ambassador to Russia the other day in the Foreign Relations Committee, when he was before us for confirmation, I put a series of questions to him and I asked him what he thought the reaction of Russia would be if we followed the recommendation of the war hawks in this country to blockade Vietnam. I asked him if he

thought the Russian flag would be lowered to that blockade. He replied in the negative; he thought that Russia would not lower its flag to the blockade. I asked what would happen after we sunk the first Russian ship. His assumption was the obvious—we would be involved in a military confrontation with Russia.

As I said before, it would not be fought in Asia, but it would be fought in New York City and in Chicago and in Portland and in Moscow and in Leningrad and around the world. I repeat it. Sometimes I get criticisms from some persons over these repetitions, but I am an old teacher. I know how important it is in the learning process to repeat and repeat until the class finally grasps the lesson. I do not give up hope that even the Congress of the United States will recognize that we cannot justify history by following a course of action which our own Ambassador admitted under examination the other day would lead to a military confrontation with Russia.

Perhaps our bombing did not cause the increased infiltration described by the press from official figures; but if its purpose was to stop or reduce it, it did not. If our purpose was to destroy the will of the North Vietnamese to aid the rebellion in the south, it has not done that, either.

In fact, many evidences come out of North Vietnam that our bombing has enhanced the determination of North Vietnam to fight back.

Our bombing, like our troop buildup in South Vietnam, has proceeded on the assumption that all the escalating would be done by the United States alone.

I find in the remarks of the Thai Foreign Minister words that apply as much to Thailand as to any other country, so I quote him:

> From a pragmatic viewpoint, it may be too much to expect that ethical considerations should prevail in the discussion of such a hotly contested international issue. In reality, the question is much more complex, involving heterogeneous elements among which are ideological bias, acute self-interests, past private feuds and instinct of revenge or simply fears of losing the beatific enjoyment of present material abundance and luxury available in profusion in certain parts of the world.

PROBLEM IS TO REDUCE, NOT RAISE, LEVEL OF WAR

No doubt any criticism of Thailand by Members of Congress will continue to be resented in a country that has abolished congresses. I do not mean to arouse controversy nor to irritate needlessly a foreign government. But when its officials urge upon the United States a policy of bombing a third country from bases on its territory, bases which cost the American taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars plus additional aid to that country, in defiance of the peace plan urged upon all warring parties by the Secretary General of the United Nations, I think some inquiry into their motives and reasoning is called for.

What worries me more than anything is the real likelihood that the arrangement we have bought in Thailand will turn out like our arrangement in South Vietnam. Eventually, the government we sheltered and financed in South Vietnam collapsed, and had to be replaced with a virtual U.S. military occupation. That is what I fear lies in store for us in Thailand, especially if China and Russia eventually came into this war.

The more we use Thailand to bomb Vietnam, the more those bases become targets and the more Americans have to be sent to protect them. It is questionable that Thailand will remain a privileged sanctuary any more than North Vietnam did, but the responsibility for her defense will lie with us.

PROSPECTS FOR MANILA CONFERENCE

President Johnson's meeting with certain Asian heads of state will, we all hope, result in some development in the direction of peace that is not now discernible. A parley of states on one side of a war does not usually seek or result in any moves toward peace other than plans for total victory. An Asian conference that included Japan, India, Pakistan, and other nonbelligerents would afford a little more impartiality and perhaps some ideas that would not occur to countries so deeply committed to the prosecution of the war as are Thailand, South Vietnam, South Korea, and the United States.

The great defect of the conference is simply that the United States is to be the only non-Asian participant, just as we are the only non-Asian participant in the war. We count ourselves an Asian power, just as we count ourselves an Atlantic power, a European power, a Middle Eastern power, a Western Hemisphere power; and we would quickly count ourselves an African power, too, should anything develop in that continent to cause us worry.

That does not make us an Asian country. It is one of the tragedies of our tremendous power that we seem to think because we have interests somewhere, we must also have prevailing power there. Small countries around a great power seem either to accept the leadership of the nation in whose shadow they live, or seek the shelter and support of a rival great power. Cuba has done the latter; so have the small countries of Asia with whom President Johnson will be meeting.

Mr. President, I close by saying that I share the fears of some of my fellow Senators who have not supported my position in opposition to the war in Vietnam, but who have expressed great concern about the spreading of U.S. military power around the world, involved, as we now are, in 42 securities treaties in all parts of the world.

I should like to see those treaties merged from bilateral treaties into multilateral treaties not as cloaks for U.S. action but genuine multilateral obligations. I should like to see us follow a course of action that would cause other nations to join with us on a multilateral basis, in order to maintain peace in the world.

I think the best way and the best place to start with that type of merging is for us to change our posture before the United Nations, and begin insisting upon our rights within that body and to have our President call upon the United Nations in no uncertain terms to take jurisdiction over this threat to the peace in southeast Asia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as exhibit 3 certain other press clippings concerning the United States and Thailand: an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for the week of September 19–25; an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of September 18, entitled "What Is Aim of United States in Thailand"; an article from the Washington Post of October 2 entitled "Spotlight on U.S. Bases Irks Thailand"; two articles by Richard Fryklund on Thailand which appeared in the Washington Star; an editorial, "Dramatic Move," from the Oregonian of September 30; and an article from the Christian Science Monitor for October 1 entitled "Vietnam: Doubts on Asian Talks."

There being no objection, the clippings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD:

(See exhibit 3.)

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Eugene Register-Guard, Sept. 29, 1966]

RED THREAT GROWS—U.S. CONCERNED OVER THAIS

(By William L. Ryan)

Americans today eye Thailand with growing concern. Enough portents and parallels exist to evoke worry that another wedge of Southeast Asia could involve United States forces in a new war with Communist guerrillas in the pattern of Vietnam.

"We ought to know what we are getting into," said Chairman J. W. FULBRIGHT of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently. "Are we to have another Vietnam war?" To inquire into the possibilities he announced his committee soon will hold hearings on the United States commitment in Thailand.

Worry over Thailand's place in a Communist timetable dates back to the founding of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) in 1954, and has deepened considerably in the past two years.

Two years ago the Communists, with the blessing and backing of Red China, announced formation in Thailand's impoverished northeast area of the "Thailand Independence Movement."

In January, 1965, Chen Yi, Red China's vice premier and foreign minister, declared "we may have a guerrilla war going in Thailand before the year is out." Days later, a Thai-language broadcast, possibly emanating from China, announced establishment of a "Patriotic Front of Thailand." This was patterned after the National Front for Liberation of South Vietnam, set up late in 1960 as the political arm of the Viet Cong.

The Thai guerrilla movement is small, but in scale and technique it is ominously similar to the Viet Cong movement of the 1959–60 period.

But—there are big differences in the two situations.

Thailand, for the most part, is prosperous and stable. Its people, 90 per cent Buddhist and far more united than the Vietnamese, on the whole dislike and distrust Communists and Chinese alike. Unlike Vietnam Thailand has a sturdy middle class and many of its peasants—80 per cent of the population—are well off by Southeast Asia standards. Unlike Vietnam, Thailand never was colonized, never partitioned. Since World War II it has been one of the staunchest allies of America in the Far East.

Thailand's role in the Vietnam war, as the site of bases whence United States planes take off, probably has made the country even more an attractive target for subversion

and guerrilla tactics inspired and supported by the Red Chinese.

Since early 1965, Communist activities in the Northeast—susceptible to infiltration across the border from an area of Laos held by the Communist Pathet Lao forces—have risen considerably. The Thai government says there were 35 assassinations of government representatives in the northeast in 1965 and more than twice that number thus far in 1966. Red China has broadcast a report that battles between government forces and guerrillas numbered 24 in 1965 and 43 in the first half of 1966.

There are as many United States troops in Thailand as there were in Vietnam early in 1965. The Pentagon has declined to disclose the figure. Unofficial estimates recently put it at 27,000–35,000. William P. Bundy, assistant secretary of state, said last week the figure was 25,000, mostly air force units. That would represent more than twice the number there in early 1965.

A United States-backed air and naval base complex has been enormously expanded. Last month, the U-Tapao airfield, built by the Americans in less than eight months, was turned over to Thai officials. This installation to the south of Bangkok has a field 11,500 feet long with 200-foot wide runway, capable of accommodating the biggest United States bombers. It is 650 miles from Hanoi.

Besides U-Tapao, built at a cost of $40 million, there are four other United States-built jet airbases in Thailand. All have been turned over to the Thai government.

There is little secret about the use of Thai bases in the Vietnam war. As long ago as January, the Associated Press reported from Saigon that probably 60 per cent of air strikes against North Vietnam were taking off from Thai bases. With the U-Tapao base now available, the percentage seems bound to rise. It should be far easier for B52 bombers to reach North Vietnam from there than from Guam.

At the enormous Sattahip naval base complex, 100 miles south of Bangkok, Americans are building a complete major port at a cost of about $90 million. When it is completed within two years it will have deep water berths, rock breakwaters, new fuel storage tanks, pipeline supply systems, improved port installations, ordnance depots, table communications and supporting facilities.

In addition, new roads with military meaning are being built in the country and existing transport routes are being upgraded. Military supplies which would be needed in the event of attack have been placed in forward positions.

Thailand has had a military government, ruling in the name of the king, since 1958. There is some unrest about this, particularly among intellectual elements who say they want more democracy, a new constitution and elections. The government under Prime Minister Thanom Kittikhachorn says the time is inappropriate because of Southeast Asia conditions and the Communist threat.

The nation, about five-sixths the size of Texas with 31 million people, is in enviable condition apart from its northeast, so far as as its economy and prospects are concerned.

By government estimate, the guerrilla movement is small. Bangkok says the Communist hard core amounts to no more than 1,500 in the northeast, operating in roaming bands of 80 to 100 men.

To counter red activity, the government has instituted, with United States help, a civic action program in the northeast, involving mobile development units, police training in counter-insurgency and establishment of a government presence in an area neglected for years by Bangkok. The Americans have provided $35 million for this program.

Communism has never caught on in Thailand. The Thai Communist Party, formed in 1946, was made up mostly of overseas Chinese, of whom Thailand has 4 million. Like overseas Chinese elsewhere, they are subject to pressures from Red Chinese agents. The Communist Party was outlawed and went underground in 1952.

But infiltration in the northeast and central parts of the country by Lao and Thai-stock people, and of Malay-stock people in the extreme south, is easy. Underground radio broadcasts boast of expanding activities aimed at "a violent counteroffensive" to overthrow the Thanon government.

The secretary-general of the Seato alliance in his annual report this month said:

"China, during the past year, turned to a wider and more intense program of subversion, seeking to undermine the anti-Communist determination of the peoples of all Southeast Asia . . . a principal target of subversion has been Thailand . . . under Peking sponsorship a number of 'patriotic front' organizations have come into being under the general political leadership of the Thai patriotic front. Communist terrorism has been most frequent in the northeast, but similar activity has also occurred in the south and some of the central provinces."

Bangkok is the headquarters of Seato, which also has an economic program in the nation. United States economic aid alone amounted to $43 million in 1965.

In comparison with other Southeast Asian countries, Thailand is thriving. Its annual growth rate reached a record 10.6 percent in 1963 and leveled off thereafter at 6.3. Its 1965 gross national product was 80.2 billion baht ($4 billion). Real output rose between 1961 and 1965 by 7.5 percent each year. Real income per person was 25 percent higher this year than in 1957.

Export earnings grow steadily. So do agricultural surpluses, mainly rice, making the country an Asian rice basket.

United States officials in Thailand say they operate on the theory that if the United States provides the tools, the Thais themselves will do the job of combatting Red subversion.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the New York Times, Oct. 7, 1966]

THE PRESIDENT'S TRIP

President Johnson's remarks about plans for his expanded trip to Asia later this month were a mixture of hopes, desires and pessimism on the progress of efforts to find a peaceful solution to the Vietnamese war.

Mr. Johnson emphasized the attempts that will be made on his trip to seek political, social and economic progress. These are vital goals; but the war will certainly dominate every meeting with the chiefs of state in New Zealand, Australia, Thailand, Malaysia and South Korea, and it will be uppermost at the Manila conference.

There is a question that could have been—but was not—asked at the President's meeting with the press yesterday:

Can the United States steadily escalate the war in Vietnam, prepare for a still bigger war next year, and at the same time bring about peace negotiations with Hanoi? Peace offers with one hand; killing, burning, defoliating, destroying, bombing with the other. The result, surely, is to cancel out each other's effectiveness.

There can be no doubt that the fundamentals of President Johnson's policy, as formulated by Ambassador Goldberg at the United Nations, still stand. The United States is not seeking territory; nor the destruction of the Hanoi Government; nor permanent bases in South Vietnam. It is prepared to cease bombing North Vietnam and withdraw American troops if Hanoi makes comparable concessions.

It is true, therefore, that the United States is fighting a limited war with "limited force," as Mr. Johnson reiterated yesterday. In effect, it is saying: "I won't kill you, but I'm going to beat you within an inch of your life, after which I hope you will come and join some of us around a table to talk peace."

The problem of credibility is a basic one. If the Hanoi Government does not believe that the United States means what it says, there can be no negotiation. Nor would the North Vietnamese test American sincerity if they felt sure that there was no sincerity. They are wrong; but it is not enough for Washington to say so.

Yet, this past week the United States showed that it could call a halt where it wanted when the bombing of a corner of the demilitarized zone between North and South Vietnam was stopped. It could be stopped in all of North Vietnam. Talk of peace plus acts of war will not add up to a negotiated settlement. The old adage that "actions speak louder than words" applies in Vietnam today as it has at all times and everywhere.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sept. 19–25, 1966]

WHY THE THAILAND SECRECY?

William P. Bundy taxes credulity when he cites the wishes of the Thai government as the main reason why the Johnson Administration refuses to discuss in open hearing details of the growing American involvement in Thailand.

Mr. Bundy, assistant secretary of state for Far Eastern affairs, explained the Administration position before a closed session of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that is trying to find out what the United States commitment in Thailand is all about. The U.S. has close to 35,000 men there, and huge bases in daily use mounting aerial attacks on Viet Nam.

The Thais, noted for their cynicism and opportunism, would like to pretend they are not giving military aid and comfort to the Americans. This is nonsense. The Chinese know what is going on. The Russians know. The North Viet Namese know. The South Viet Namese know. The Cambodians know. The Laotians know. Even American newspaper readers know—in part. But the American government says it cannot tell its own people the facts because a client state doesn't want it to.

Chairman FULBRIGHT and other members of the committee fear, and so do we, that the United States is quietly getting involved in another Viet Nam in Thailand. Indeed, we are inclined to wonder whether it is the Thais or the Americans who really want to keep the activities secret. The American people have 300,000 men fighting an undeclared war in Viet Nam; what is the United States getting into in Thailand?

Since there is no question whatever of national security, why the secrecy?

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sept. 18, 1966]

WHAT IS AIM OF UNITED STATES IN THAILAND?—SENATOR FULBRIGHT SEEKS THE ADMINISTRATION'S ANSWER IN NEW HEARINGS

(By Richard Dudman)

WASHINGTON, September 17.—When and if Secretary of State Dean Rusk goes before Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT in the much-postponed hearings on American involvement in Thailand, the immediate issue will be whether the hearings should be held at all.

The Johnson Administration is trying to maintain the official secrecy that surrounds a current rapid buildup of U.S. military force in Thailand and its role as an American privileged sanctuary for air raids against North Viet Nam.

FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, wants a full airing of the situation in public hearings to see whether the United States is getting into

another Viet Nam without any public debate.

The issue is one of politics and diplomacy, not security. The Russians and the Chinese certainly know about the American bases and buildup already.

Rusk first was scheduled to appear Sept. 12 in executive session. That hearing was cancelled when he went to the hospital with a case of grippe. He was then slated to testify next Thursday, but his appearance at the United Nations General Assembly most of next week interfered.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara is expected to be called after Rusk testifies. The plan is to explore with both secretaries in closed session the Administration's reasons for seeking to avoid full public discussion of what is going on in Thailand.

Because of schedule difficulties, it has turned out that William P. Bundy, assistant secretary of state for Far Eastern affairs, will be the first witness, in a closed session Tuesday. It was he who first breached the official secrecy by saying publicly two weeks ago that the United States already had about 25,000 troops in Thailand.

Some of Bundy's colleagues in the Administration were unhappy over his public acknowledgment of the buildup.

How can Rusk and McNamara refuse to testify in public session when Bundy has already been talking his head off?" one official asked. "All the committee has to do is ask them whether they can't say what a subordinate says. The committee also could ask whether the Administration attaches more importance to a television show than to a Senate committee.

Bundy had chosen his words carefully. He had said that the buildup was "no secret."

In this respect, the situation in Thailand has been following the pattern of the early buildup in Viet Nam. For some years, no official would state on the record the number of American troops in Viet Nam, but reporters were given the total from time to time on a "background" basis. The reason, in that case, was to avoid public admission that the United States was violating the 1954 Geneva agreements, which limited American troops there to about 600.

In Thailand today, a reporter can learn the current number of U.S. troops, but only on a "background" basis. The reason this time is that the Thai government insists on secrecy as a condition for permitting American military use of Thai territory.

Eighteen months ago, the United States had about the same number of troops in Viet Nam that it has in Thailand today. Although the American forces in Viet Nam now have taken over much of the combat role, combat originally was supposed to be left to the Viet Namese.

President Johnson, in his campaign against Barry Goldwater in 1964, denounced those who "call upon us to supply American boys to do the job that Asian boys should do." Mr. Johnson described the American mission in Viet Nam as getting the South Viet Namese "to save their own freedom with their own men." He said that the United States would supply such help in training and equipment "as we can give them."

Using similar language two weeks ago in speaking about Thailand Bundy said that the Thais faced a real threat of insurgency in the northeast part of their country. As he put it, "the Thais are dealing with that themselves, and our role is to supply them equipment and to assist them in training as they may desire."

He declined to comment on reports that the U.S. embassy in Bangkok has asked Washington to go beyond that role.

The Post-Dispatch reported Aug. 26 that Ambassador Graham Martin had forwarded an urgent request from the Thai government for American helicopters with American crews to combat increasing Communist guerrilla activity in northeast Thailand.

There are layers of secrecy and sensitivity in what is going on in Thailand. At each successive level, information is harder to get, officials are more reluctant to talk or testify, and the Thais are more outraged at public exposure.

Best known is the bare number of U.S. troops and the equipment and training of Thai troops, which Bundy described as the major American role there.

At a more sensitive level is the use of American air bases in Thailand to bomb North Viet Nam, United States Air Force sources have said that 80 per cent of the strikes against the North are from Thailand.

Still deeper are such matters as the secret transfer of a Thai artillery battalion into Laos, where the troops have been given honorary Laotian citizenship as what are sometimes called "sheep-dip Laotians." The unit is said to be operating under Laotian command as part of an effort to keep the Communist-led Pathet Lao forces from pressing toward the Mekong river, which divides the two countries.

When FULBRIGHT first spoke of the plan for hearings on Thailand two weeks ago, he suggested some of the questions that ought to be answered: "What is the precise nature of our 'commitment' to Thailand? On what legal basis are we there? Are we identifying ourselves too closely with an unpopular and unrepresentative regime? Will a massive foreign military presence in Thailand engender hostility among a people who have never been colonized? Will Thailand's involvement in the war in Viet Nam shorten the war or enlarge it?"

"These questions have been raised either explicitly or implicitly by American journalists," FULBRIGHT said. "I believe we have a responsibility to raise them here and to have the Administration's replies."

In approaching the secrecy issue, the committee could well ask why the present reticence over a major involvement when there was great candor when President John F. Kennedy sent 5,000 troops to Thailand in May 1962.

Mr. Kennedy issued a statement saying that Thailand had invited the American forces because Communist forces in Laos had attacked and moved toward the Thai border. Thailand announced the decision to its own people instead of letting them judge for themselves by the roar of the jets, as in the present case. The United States notified the United Nations, moreover, and SEATO issued a public statement.

An Administration strategist was asked this week why all the publicity in 1962 and all the secrecy now.

"If you will forgive what may sound like a cynical remark," he said, "the reason is that then it was for show and now we mean business."

The American-Thai arrangement grew out of a unilateral pledge made by Rusk to the Thai Foreign Minister on March 6, 1962, two months before Mr. Kennedy sent troops on that earlier occasion. They agreed that the SEATO treaty "provides the basis for the signatories collectively to assist Thailand in the event of Communist armed attack against that country."

Rusk anticipated that some other signers might not agree to intervene. He stated that "this obligation of the United States does not depend upon the prior agreement of all other parties to the treaty, since this treaty obligation is individual as well as collective."

Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY carried Rusk's promise a step further last February when he pledged that the United States would "provide all necessary assistance to enable Thailand and other countries of Southeast Asia threatened by Communist aggression to defend themselves and to achieve in peace their just economic and social aims."

No such strong commitment existed in the case of Viet Nam. The Johnson Administration eventually resorted to an interpretation of the SEATO treaty after first relying on a limited and conditional offer of aid by President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The argument for exposure is that the American people ought to be aware of what their government is getting them into and have a chance to debate the matter.

The argument for continued secrecy is, first, that this country made a deal with Thailand and should stick to it. Thai officials control the behavior of legislators and the flow of information in their own country and cannot understand why the most powerful nation in the world cannot do the same in its own country.

Such agreements with other countries on covert operations can be successful only if the "noise level" remains low. In the case of the operations in Thailand, the noise level lately has risen to a roar. Some officials consider this a breach of security, although not in the sense of giving a foreign enemy information not otherwise available to him.

Behind Thailand's mounting annoyance over public discussions of operations there is thought to be concern about its posture in the event of a major Communist attack, such as a big subversion campaign or outright invasion from Laos.

If Thailand had ostensibly been merely minding its own business, it could pose as another Belgium, an innocent victim of unprovoked attack. If, on the other hand, the world knew Thailand was a major base for American military action in Viet Nam, some might say that it was getting what was coming to it.

As a practical matter, American violation of the non-publicity agreement will give Thailand new leverage in limiting the input and use of American men and weapons, in seeking additional assistance that the United States is not prepared to give and in raising the rent on the American bases.

"We'll live through the hearings," an official said this week, "but afterward we'll have to pay the Thais two or three times as much for what they're doing for us."

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 2, 1966]

SPOTLIGHT ON U.S. BASES IRKS THAILAND—NATION RESENTS WASHINGTON TALK ABOUT OPEN SECRET OF U.S. MIGHT

(By Murrey Marder)

BANGKOK.—Officials of this country that serves as a huge launching platform for air strikes on Communist installations in North Vietnam and Laos are bristling over the kind of attention focused on Thailand from Washington.

"What is the United States trying to do to us?" they indignantly demand in private "We have given you every support in the anti-Communist struggle. Why must you advertise it and make things worse for us?"

The United States and Thailand are caught by a double standard of national behavior over the semisecret military operations conducted from this moderately authoritarian nation of 30 million people with little experience in publicly questioning the acts of government. It is a case of two nations with a common objective, but markedly different values, jointly trying to pursue a quasicovert policy.

"All we asked of you," said one grieved Thai Foreign Ministry official, "was one thing: just to keep quiet officially about what you were doing here. All right, your press has revealed what is going on, so it is no secret any more. But why must you continue to talk about it? Why give ammunition to your enemies and our enemies?"

Even the most Westernized Thai officials profess bewilderment over the inability of the Occidental mind to grasp what is to them a clear distinction between what is done and what needs to be admitted officially, particularly in warfare.

When Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT (D.-Ark.) announced what proved to be short-lived hearings to determine, as he put it, if another Vietnam was in the making in Thailand, Bangkok officialdom bubbled.

THE CONTRAILS SHOW

The Thai people never have been officially informed about what is happening in their country, although many are at least dimly aware of it. They can see the contrails of American planes streaking toward North Vietnam or Laos. They can see, or are even working on, the American bases spread strategically over the countryside. They rub shoulders unenthusiastically, and in some areas resentfully, with American troops, although efforts are made to limit the GI impact on the population.

When the facade of secrecy about Thai-based American air attacks on North Vietnam and Laos was fractured by press accounts early in 1965, the Americans were hardly surprised. It was impossible to keep secret indefinitely from the American public what are now eight air bases either built or in progress with a force of over 30,000 American military personnel.

But when the news reports first appeared that Thai bases were fielding about 80 per cent of the land-based air power that strikes North Vietnam, and the bulk of the air missions against Communist infiltration routes across Laos, Thai officials simply denied it.

"No American planes have taken off from Thai airfields to attack targets in North Vietnam," said Prime Minister of Defense Thanom Kittikachorn. The United States Embassy here concurred completely, honoring what had been agreed upon between Bangkok and Washington as a vital part of the quid pro quo for the American operations.

As the press reports nevertheless continued to swell, Gen. Praphas Charusathien, Deputy Prime Minister, army commander in chief, Minister of the Interior and strong man of the Thai regime, tried a different tack in September, 1965.

"What is a base?" he said when asked by hesitant Thai newsmen about the reports in the American press. "This is what comes of persons who are ignorant of military technical terms using military language.

"Can a big airfield where an American soldier is standing be called a military base?" he went on. "It is not a base. It is not even a military stronghold. What it should be called more correctly is a stopover station, not a base."

American military units in Thailand, he explained, were simply helping to build roads. "Regarding American flight routes in Thailand, they are only a military assistance agreement, not for setting up any American air base. Permission is given only for American planes to land and take off, staying overnight, for refueling and for any repairs that might be needed. We are given aid by America in exchange . . . That is what is called mutual military assistance . . . "

But behind the scenes, Thai officials were berating American officials, charging a breach of confidence in the failure of the United States to curb its press.

A JOINT CELEBRATION

In time, as the American influx expanded constantly and the construction of such potentially huge installations as the air and naval base at Sattahip on the Gulf of Siam became impossible to conceal, Thai officials reconciled themselves to the inevitable.

When Sattahip, which conceivably one day may be the successor to the great base at Singapore in Western defense, opened last Aug. 10 the secrecy wraps came off enough to permit both Prime Minister Thanom and United States Ambassador Graham A. Martin to participate publicly in the celebration. But the lid has remained on any official acknowledgment of the origins or destinations of the ever-increasing numbers of American bombers flying from Thailand. American planes often limp back from mass flights over North Vietnam to bases that are officially nonexistent.

This uncomfortable official position is bound to become intolerable with a major expansion of the American war effort reportedly in the making. The word filtering through the combat zone is that current limitations on North Vietnam bombing targets will be progressively lifted.

STILL FEW GUERRILLAS

Intensification of the aerial warfare from Thailand will also increase the risk of Communist retaliation against the American bases, although there is still little subversive warfare here, and that at the terroristic and propagandist level. At a maximum, there are about as many guerrillas in Thailand now as there were in South Vietnam in 1959–60.

Communist guerrilla activity here rose appreciably between December and last May, then leveled off. American strategists are uncertain whether the slowdown was caused by the record monsoon floods over the whole Mekong River basin or by Communist hesitancy to produce enough chaos to bring American combat troops into Thailand.

It has been denied on all sides that American combat troops are in Thailand. But Special Force units are here giving training in guerrilla warfare, about 25 American helicopters are engaged in antiguerrilla combat support and it would be an easy slide from combat training to combat if the Thai government should decide that it requires help of that kind.

What is gnawing at United States officials is their awareness that the Johnson Administration's damaged credibility in the Vietnam conflict is being damaged still more by its ambiguous position in Thailand. There would be considerable relief on the American side if Thailand would take the United States off the secrecy hook.

"What is (Secretary of State) Dean Rusk supposed to do," privately complained one unhappy American official, "call the Thai Prime Minister a liar? It's their country; they have to live here after we go, as they pointedly remind us.

ALLIES IN RESIDENCE

American officials like to point out that United States forces are not the only foreign military personnel in this nation that serves as headquarters for the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

The Australians have an F–86 squadron at Ubon, one of the American-manned bases that fly the Thai flag, with 160 men. Forty other Australians are engaged in SEATO operations and multilateral military research. The British have 440 engineers conducting an airfield near Mukdahan in northeastern Thailand, the most underdeveloped section of this nation, where the Communist guerrilla pressure centers. New Zealand has 16 engineers supervising construction of security roads in the northeast.

The Thais consider this aid, and the much larger American support, as only their due for their vigorous anticommunism. But they have a highly sensitive concept of their sovereignty and independence and are now concerned that a bitter fruit of the American assistance is that the United States Senate is threatening to pry into "our national life."

The Thais, who managed to escape the 19th century colonization of much of Asia, were shocked when Sen. FULBRIGHT said, after a closed-door hearing on Thailand, that he had the impression that American policy in Asia was headed toward something close to "colonial rule."

Because FULBRIGHT is a major critic of the American policy in Vietnam, to which Thailand is deeply committed, he is now the Thais' archvillain.

Officially, Prime Minister Thanom conceded on Sept. 5 that FULBRIGHT had a "right to ask such questions (about American aid to Thailand) of his Government in the Senate." What the Thais forcefully reject, however, is the right of any American official to cast public aspersions on Thailand.

The Thais evidently never thought that the American commitment here would open the door to questioning about the prevalence of corruption or the shortcomings of democracy in Thailand ("We are in the transition stages of advancement to democracy; you must not try to compare us to your version of democracy"), or to public discussion of whether Thailand is or might become a "puppet" of United States policy.

Nothing infuriates their officials more. "You are our 'guests' here," said one angry official. "We can ask you to leave any time we choose."

The Thais cite a regional pattern to justify their insistence on secrecy about American military operations here. North Vietnam denies that it has any troops engaged in South Vietnam, they say, and Prime Minister Souvanna Phouma refuses to acknowledge American anti-Communist aerial combat in Laos. Why, then, they ask, should Thailand have to behave differently just because of internal political requirements in the United States?

"What good will it do Thailand to acknowledge officially what nobody else in this region admits?" they ask. "It can only result in more people saying more bad things about Thailand."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star]

ANOTHER VIETNAM? UNITED STATES THAILAND BUILDUP—FORCE STILL GROWING

(By Richard Fryklund)

The basic facts of the "secret" American buildup in Thailand are easy to find—but not the answer to Sen. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT'S question: "What are we getting into?"

The facts are these:

There are 26,000 American servicemen (two-thirds of them Air Force) in Thailand, and the number is still growing.

The Air Force is flying almost 200 planes from seven major Thai airfields in the air war against Communist forces in Viet Nam and Laos.

The Army is building a logistics, supply and communications base in Thailand which could support one American Army corps—that is, three American divisions, or 100,000 men, in some future ground, sea and air combat.

And American military and civilian advisers are helping the Thai government extend its authority into remote villages that may—or may not—be threatened by a Communist uprising and invasion.

The purpose of the buildup is to avoid the U.S. mistake in Viet Nam—too little and too late.

It has been described only in the sketchiest way by American officials because the Thai government wants it to be an official secret—for reasons of domestic and foreign policy which the Americans must respect if they are to stay.

The Thai government seems convinced that it faces a typical Communist war of national liberation, and it is reacting strongly, with American help.

Sen. FULBRIGHT, D.–Ark., chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, said recently that the American public should be told about the buildup and what the United States is getting into.

FULBRIGHT suggests that we may be getting into another Viet Nam and that this is the time for Congress and the public to object.

He's pointing toward open hearings on the Thai buildup—if the Johnson administration will go along.

Here is what he will find:

The U.S. Air Force is using the Thai bases because those in South Viet Nam are limited in capacity, because the Thai bases are closer to many of the targets, and because the Thais are willing to support, quietly, a war they believe is protecting them.

The American fighter-bombers and reconnaissance planes operate principally from four Thai airbases at Takhli, Korat, Udorn and Ubon. Refueling tankers, KC135s, also use the Don Muang airfield at Bangkok and the field at the navy base at Sattahip on the Gulf of Siam.

Another base at Khon Kaen is being extended from 4,000 feet to 11,000 feet runways for American jet use.

AIR STRIKES FROM THAI

Most of the U.S. Air Force strikes against North Vietnamese targets are launched from the Thai fields, and most of the tonnage dropped over North Viet Nam is carried in Air Force planes.

Thus, the bases are essential for a high rate of bombing in the North.

Air Force operations are commanded by Maj. Gen. Charles R. Bond, deputy commander of the American 7th and 13th Air Forces headquarters at Udorn.

The bases themselves are owned and commanded by the Thai Air Force. The Americans are guests.

The buildup for possible American ground combat is under the direction of the 9th Logistics Command at Korat. It has three basic jobs:

Maintain stockpiled combat equipment for one American brigade (a third of a division, about 6,000 men).

Maintain stockpiled support equipment (vehicles, barbed wire, bulldozers, locomotives, etc.) sufficient to supply one full U.S. infantry division.

Build supply and communications pipelines capable of supporting a full American corps.

The 9th Logistics Command is preparing the way for an emergency fire-fighting force, the brigade, or a holding operation, the division, or the left arm of a pincer movement, the corps (if the allied side decides some day to pinch off the North Vietnamese infiltration routes through southern Laos and North Viet Nam.)

If the 9th Logistics Command does its job right—and it's about half through now—it will provide support facilities in case of a war. The same operation took almost a year to carry out in Viet Nam, after the war started.

In South Viet Nam, the pace of the American buildup was set largely by the supply bottlenecks. Ports had to be built, since the port of Saigon was vulnerable and inadequate. Fuel pipelines, roads, airfields, radio links and storage facilities had to be installed under the VC guns.

In Thailand, two U.S. Army Engineer battalions, the 809th and 538th, are supervising American and Thai construction companies in similar projects now.

The port of Bangkok is as inadequate as the port of Saigon, for similar reasons. It is 21 miles up a narrow, shallow river and it dumps materiel into a crowded, busy city.

BUILD NEW PORT

So the 809th is building a new port at Sattahip, at the corner of the Gulf of Siam, the location of an old and sleepy Thai navy base.

Sattahip will be able to handle simultaneously nine offloading ships of any size; it will be able to pump aviation fuel directly from the ship to the KC135 tankers on the 11,500-foot runway; it will be able to support a U.S. naval patrol force and store and transship supplies for an Army corps.

The 809th will soon move into northeast Thailand to build small airstrips and local roads.

When all this is finished, the supply movers will have elaborate road, rail, pipeline and air routes to the warehouses near Korat and adequate road, rail and air routes to the consumers in northeast Thailand, where the business is presumed to be.

Another function of the U.S. armed forces in Thailand is to advise and assist the Thai government in handling this business, modest now but extensive in the future, if the Viet Nam pattern is being followed.

There is disagreement among American observers whether the pattern is being followed, whether a North Vietnamese and Chinese-led insurgency has started.

EVIDENCE CITED

The evidence for such a crisis, which convinces American military and diplomatic leaders there, is that North Vietnamese and Chinese radio broadcasts have announced the formation of a "Patriotic Front of Thailand," made up of Communist leaders and some fictional Thai worker and farmer groups, and that guerrilla operations have started.

The incidents are similar to those in the early stages of the struggle in South Viet Nam—killings, kidnapings, sabotage.

But a direct chain of command between Hanoi and the guerrillas has not been established by American intelligence.

Some American officials see strong signs of Red activity.

But officials in other American agencies say the troubles in Thailand also can be explained by traditional banditry, perhaps combined with inexperienced local Communist leadership.

The Fulbright investigation may end up with a choice between two answers to the senator's question of, What are we getting into?"

The U.S. buildup in Thailand may either be the stitch in time which will avert another Viet Nam or it may be another American foot sinking slowly into the Asian quagmire.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star]

WE PREPARE TO CUT AN ENEMY LIFELINE

(By Richard Critchfield)

BANGKOK.—United States military preparations in Thailand are being geared to the possible need to move at least three American combat divisions into Laos in an attempt to cut off the Ho Chi Minh trail, according to authoritative sources here.

This possibility is based on the expectation that Hanoi will continue to infiltrate regular North Vietnamese divisions southward over the next few years. It is felt here that the 800-mile system of jungle trails and dirt roads through the Laotian panhandle would be Hanoi's main line of supply southward for ammunition, reinforcements and equipment.

The military experts are not unanimous. Vietnamese generals in Saigon predict the Viet Cong, reinforced by six of North Viet Nam's 11 regular army divisions, in April will launch a "now or never" attempt at a final offensive. Some American military sources in Saigon estimate the Viet Cong now have enough weapons and ammunition stored in South Viet Nam to keep fighting for two years. Others maintain that up to 75 per cent of the Communists' supplies come by sea, down the Mekong and overland through Cambodia.

In Thailand, preparations for sending American troops into Laos have been underway since the height of the Laotian crisis in 1961–62, when Washington, at Bangkok's insistence, concluded a mutual defense agreement outside the United States SEATO obligations.

Since then a $40 million yearly U.S.-Thai military development program has built a network of primarily military roads linking Bangkok with Thailand's 1,000-mile Laotian frontier, mostly along the Mekong river. This included the $20 million Friendship Highway and its Bangkok Bypass, which U.S. Army engineers are now helping to finish. A $30 million depot of tanks, jeeps, armored personnel carriers, artillery and weapons has been built up at Camp Friendship near Korat Airbase. There will eventually be enough to equip a combat division.

This winter, work has been speeded on the U.S. construction of a jet strip, deep-water pier and ammunition bunkers near Thailand's big Sattahip Naval Airbase, to handle a rapid influx of troops.

These troops would not be destined for Thailand but for Laos. The Thai government already is highly sensitive to the presence of nearly 8,000 U.S. Air Force men and 4,000 Army engineers. U.S. military sources insist that no more U.S. troops are contemplated for garrisoning in Thailand.

On the other hand, Agence Lao Presse, the official Cambodian news service, reported that special presidential envoy Averell Harriman assured Prince Norodom Sihanouk during his recent visit that the United States had no plans to commit American ground troops in Laos.

Thailand's uneasiness over the growing American presence here was underscored last week when Lt. Gen. Kricha Punnakanta, the government's press chief, repudiated reports that U.S. aircraft were bombing North Viet Nam from bases in Thailand.

Gen. Kricha's staff reportedly includes one man who keeps a scrapbook of some 60 clippings from American newspapers reporting that most of the U.S. airstrikes against North Viet Nam and Laos are carried out by U.S. attack squadrons stationed at Thai bases. In addition, some U.S. papers have reported most of the air-sea rescue operations over North Viet Nam are carried out by helicopters and amphibious planes based at the Mekong river town of Nakorn Phanom and that there are scattered U.S. radar installations elsewhere in the country.

All of this is absolutely factual. But the notion of "foreign bases" is so distasteful in modern Asia and the traditions of patriotism and obedience so deeply ingrained in most Thais that everyone seems willing to preserve the fiction of their non-existence even as the F–105 Thunderchiefs scream overhead. When Gen. Punnakanta admonished a recent press conference, "We all know that U.S. aircraft on North Viet Nam missions are from their own ships and not from Thailand," not one Thai newsman batted an eyelash.

LEFTWING FERVOR MISSING IN THAIS

This sensitivity is partly the result of Thailand's history. In the 19th century, by playing off the British against the French, Thailand (then Siam) alone of the Asians except Japan escaped colonialism. As a result, its people today are remarkably free of anti-colonialist complexes or serious left-wing revolutionary fervor. The revolutionary ideas of the West, whether of Karl Marx or Thomas Jefferson, have never ruffled Thailand's calm surface.

Thus, if Thailand is a Southeast Asia domino, it is a domino firmly held upright by a mixture of national pride, a pure strain of Theravada Buddhism, an adored and revered monarchy and, more recently, an upsurge of wealth on a continent of want.

Thailand, like Japan, has treated the West as a kind of bargain basement, the place where you went shopping for transistor radios, training in administration and science, hydroelectric projects and the latest jazz tunes.

Coming from tragic Viet Nam, a visitor is at first repelled by the political apathy and popular obedience to authority. But Thailand seems to be a country one is wise to accept on its own terms.

It has a military dictatorship of sorts, with the power held by Army Gen. Praphas Charusathira, who controls the 85,000-man army and 55,000 police. But Thailand's real rulers are an oligarchy of some 10,000 families who have dominated business, the military and civil service for 600 years. Prime Minister Thanom Kittikachorn, is a sounding board for various factions within this elite.

UPSURGE OF WEALTH THREAT TO HEIRARCHY

While the American mission has encouraged a trend toward constitutionalism and the adoption of some of the trappings of democracy, the Thai peasantry, who comprise 75 per cent of the population, has virtually no political consciousness.

More likely to break apart the hierarchical structure than any peasant movement from below, a Peking-backed insurgency are the economic forces unleashed by the upsurge of wealth. The privately-owned Bangkok Bank, for instance, recently launched a violent attack on the government's long-standing policy of buying rice cheaply from the peasants and selling it for higher prices on the world market.

Perhaps even more important than their history is the character of the Thai people themselves. They are easy going, pliable, good humored and yet almost impossible to corner. Says one experienced American diplomat, "We can have nice, pleasant, superficially friendly relations with these people but when it comes down to negotiations they can be tough and stubborn. They drive a hard bargain."

How hard a bargain they drive in the coming months seems likely to turn on how much the bloody war in Viet Nam threatens to spill over into Thailand. One European observer, who knows the Thais well, cautions, "The Thai attitude is quite cynical. They don't care where the war is fought to a finish—Viet Nam, Laos or even China—as long as it's not fought in Thailand." He pointed out there was already some resentment of the American troops in the small towns near the big U.S. airbases. "It's much like the British objection after World War II—'They're overpaid, over-sexed and over here.'"

The spread of the war could take several forms. The least likely threat is the most publicized in Bangkok's headlines that the 1,500 or so Peking-backed Thai guerrilla bands in the impoverished northeast or the 500-odd Chinese guerrillas south in the Kra Isthmus who fled Malaya in 1960 with their leader, Chin Peng, after their defeat by the British, could stage Viet Nam-style uprisings.

The northeast is a quagmire in the summer monsoon season and a dustbowl in winter. An area the size of Illinois and populated by one-third of Thailand's 30 million people, superficially it would seem ripe for insurgency.

COMMUNIST MENACE NOT IMMINENT

Yet this reporter, just returned from a week's tour of some of the most sensitive areas in the northeast, found virtually every Thai and American interviewed, felt confident that the Communist guerrilla threat there was not imminent but long term.

Though no one could say for sure just how much of a Communist iceberg lurked below the surface, one gained a strong impression that Peking's vaunted "guerrilla war in Thailand" was not much further off the ground than it was when Ho Chi Minh was there from 1928 to 1930 trying to organize a Communist-led peasant uprising.

The 31 officially listed "terrorist assassinations" since January, 1965, were almost all the result of Thai police-initiated penetrations into remote areas to break up the 40-year-old Communist infrastructure. The terrain and the nature of the counter-insurgency seemed more like U.S. revenue agents trying to break up a mountain moonshine operation than anything resembling the war in Viet Nam.

Most encouraging was the true appreciation by Thai and American officials of the nature and form of the Communist threat. They were trying to counter it primarily through political and economic remedies and not relying excessively on suppression or military action. Counter-guerrilla operations, except for limited military participation in civic action and a two-week jungle sweep last month, were being conducted by well-trained Thai civilian police.

The Thais, mostly by themselves (U.S. economic aid is a trifling $19 million a year in grants), were building roads, establishing schools, constructing irrigation projects and digging wells. An embryonic 57-man Thai Peace Corps had just been started.

WATER SCARCE MOST OF YEAR

The fundamental problem in the northeast is the scarcity of water most of the year, despite torrential summer floods. To alleviate this problem, scores of small basins and ponds have been dug and 4 small dams have either been built or are under construction with 12 others under study. These are short-term measures, however.

The real solution for northeast Thailand's 10 million improverished people would be a huge $600 million dam at Pa Mong, reaching across the Mekong River from Laos to Thailand. Feasibility studies were recently completed by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, which estimates the dam could be rushed to completion by 1975. When finished it would have a larger reservoir than any now existent in the United States and would irrigate 2.5 million acres now stricken by floods and drought and bring electric power to almost half of Thailand's people.

UNESCO Ambassador James Roosevelt visited Pa Mong recently on a fact-finding mission for President Johnson, a hint that part of the President's $1 billion Asian development fund may be invested in Pa Mong. Since the Thais prefer to borrow from international lending agencies like the World Bank or the just-created Asian Bank, perhaps the Soviet Union could also be brought in on the financing. Not coincidentally, pictures of Roosevelt shaking hands with the Russian Ambassador to Thailand were featured on the front pages of Bangkok's newspaper.

In January, 1965, Chinese Foreign Minister Chen Yi declared "we may have a guerrilla war in Thailand before the year is out." That same month Peking bought the equivalent of $1 million in Thai currency on the Hong Kong market.

A measure of Peking's failure to get its money's worth was suggested in threatened Sakol Nakhon province, whose Deputy Governor Anek Kanyanant told me local Communist agents were offering Thai youths as much as $50 a month to serve as guerrillas. This is equal to about a third of the average northeastern peasant's yearly earnings.

Having failed to crank up a genuine insurgency in Thailand, Peking and Hanoi might still try launching sneak mortar attacks on the U.S. airbases at Ubon, Udorn and Nakorn Phanom. U.S. military men, who do not discount the possibility, predict this would boomerang by triggering off a violent nationalistic response.

Other political observers are not so sure. They point out an outbreak of fighting, however brief, would provide fuel for such critics of "too ominous an American presence" as former Prime Minister Khaung Apiwong.

U.S. military sources tend to view the 40,000 North Vietnamese refugee community, largely centered in the northeastern towns, as openly loyal to Ho Chi Minh.

One U.S. military source estimated as many as 80 per cent of the Vietnamese refugees were discreetly working for the Communists. Here again, American civilian officials on the spot see things slightly differently. Most of them put this figure much lower and stressed that the refugees were mostly Catholic, clannish, urban artisans and tradesmen who revere Ho but have demonstrated their desire not to share the misery of his garrison state. Certainly, in many of the houses where Ho Chi Minh's picture is framed with flowers and bronze candlesticks, there was also a calender of Thailand's wildly popular Miss Universe, Apasra Hongsakul or "Pook" as she is nicknamed.

HO CHI MINH TRAIL PRIMARY PROBLEM

Another possibility mentioned by U.S. military men here is that while Peking is unlikely to risk surfacing its clandestine political apparatus in the northeast just for the sake of a tactical diversion this summer, it may have created a small, segregated group of guerrillas to be sacrificed in a bloody attempt to create an illusion Maoist war is spreading to Thailand. The fact that Thai peasant boys are being recruited for $50 a month suggests they may be intended victims.

More probable, in the military view, is that Hanoi's primary interest this spring and summer will be in maintaining the Ho Chi Minh trail with the least amount of interference.

In this analysis, while the North Vietnamese might try to secure the trail's "shoulder" by seizing the strategic Bolevens plateau in southern Laos, it is unlikely to stir up any more trouble elsewhere in Laos or in Thailand.

Much hinges on the official American, but not universally shared, assessment that the Thais are not worried about too overwhelming an American commitment as much as they are worried that it may be too little. The test would probably have to await any decision by President Johnson to move U.S. troops into Laos.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, Sept. 30, 1966]

DRAMATIC MOVE

The "summit conference" of chiefs of state in Manila next month, which President Johnson has agreed to attend, should not be confused with the all-Asian peace conference which Thailand, the Philippines and Malaysia had earlier proposed as a means of ending the war in Viet Nam.

All the countries to be represented in Manila—the United States, South Viet Nam, Thailand, the Philippines, South Korea, Australia and New Zealand—are involved to greater or lesser degree in the fighting against the Communists in Viet Nam. Thus the talks of their heads of state will be a kind of family conference, reviewing the military aspects of the war, the chances for peace and the economic prospects of Viet Nam.

The proposed all-Asian conference presumably would be attended by other Asian countries, including Japan, India, Pakistan and Indonesia, if they would come. Hanoi already has rejected any such meeting as a "peace farce" put forward by "the willful servants of the United States." Even without Communist participation and with the absence of the United States, which would not attend for obvious reasons, a meeting of other Asian nations, large and small, conceivably might come up with some workable peace negotiation suggestions.

No such result can be expected from the Manila conference, since only allies of South Viet Nam and that country itself will be represented. Some good results in coordinating the war effort, in analyzing possible ways to peace and in improving economic conditions may be hoped for, however.

The Manila session, discussed by President Johnson and President Ferdinand E. Marcos of the Philippines during the latter's recent visit to Washington, will be held shortly before the U.S. congressional elections. Obviously its timing has political implications. President Johnson has been expected to make a dramatic move of some kind before the elections to strengthen the position of Democrats in general and supporters of his Viet Nam policy in particular.

Republican leaders have latched on to the earlier all-Asian conference proposal and may have made considerable political impact with it. The Manila meeting is a clever counter move by Mr. Johnson. Although it cannot end the war, it does represent definite action in contrast to a mere idea.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 1, 1966]

VIETNAM: DOUBTS ON ASIA TALKS

(By John Hughes)

SAIGON.—Beneath the official protestations of enthusiasm, there is a current of unease and skepticism in South Vietnam about the up-coming Manila conference.

The government is happy because the conference represents a rallying of its allies, a gathering of nations committed in Vietnam for whom the war is a just cause.

But some intellectuals and politicians think otherwise. The more suspicious are anxious lest Premier Nguyen Cao Ky try to extract from Manila a new personal triumph.

And among others there is puzzlement over what the conference is actually supposed to achieve, unless it be a boost for President Johnson on the eve of difficult elections at home.

For if the conference is after peace, how, they ponder, can there be any breakthrough at a gathering loaded with Washington's allies, and from which even the Indians and Japanese are absent, let alone somebody who might speak for the Communist side?

UNHAPPY MEMORIES

Some politicians less than enthusiastic about Premier Ky have unhappy memories of his Honolulu conference with President Johnson in February of this year. At it, Premier Ky was given the presidential blessing, returning to Saigon highly confident, in an aura of American approval.

To Honolulu there was supposed to be a follow-up conference several months later. But this was quietly junked because by then Premier Ky was deeply embroiled in conflict with the Buddhists, and the young pilot-turned-Premier with whom President Johnson had decided to sink or swim had very nearly sunk.

Now, with Premier Ky well on top of the Buddhist situation again, the English-language Saigon Post gives a hint of what may be in the Ky regime's thinking. It is a hint particularly significant because the paper is owned by a Vietnamese Cabinet official high in Premier Ky's administration.

CIVILIAN TRANSITION

An editorial Thursday declares that for the administration Manila will serve "as a replacement for the second Honolulu conference which was impossible to hold because of the Buddhist crisis."

This, of course, is exactly what some of Premier Ky's opponents are afraid of.

From their point of view, it was a particularly unhappy coincidence that the sponsors of the Manila conference chose to announce it on the very day South Vietnam's brand-new constituent assembly held its inaugural meeting.

The assembly session underlined the fact that the country is moving away from military rule and taking some delicate steps down the rocky road to civilian, and hopefully representative, government again. But a heady triumph for Premier Ky at Manila might undo all this.

Thus the Vietnam Guardian calls anxiously in an editorial Thursday for Premier Ky to take with him a delegation of prominent politicians "so as not to give the impression that he will attend such an important conference in a personal capacity."

CHOICE OF MARCOS STUDIED

Meanwhile, there lingers some puzzlement as to what the Manila conference is actually supposed to do. Is it in furtherance of President Johnson's search for peace? If so, its composition of nations toughly allied to the United States seems provocative to any Communists about to negotiate.

The choice of President Marcos of the Philippines to announce the conference is also the subject for discussion. He has proved a splendidly sturdy ally of the United States. But that is enough to finish him in the eyes of Hanoi or Peking.

Asian he may be, but hardly one acceptable to the hard-headed Asians running the Communist side of the war in Vietnam.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNITED STATES FORFEITING INITIATIVE OF GLOBAL LEADERSHIP

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, just 4 years ago, the security of the United States and the destiny of the free world were bolstered by the reasoned rebuff of the Soviet Union during the Cuban missile crisis.

Poll findings, prematurely released by the U.S. Information Agency in March of 1963, showed that millions of people in Western Europe respected the resolute but limited use of American power in the face of aggressive provocation. Our finest friends and allies believed that we had effectively reduced the chances of war, and possibly opened up new avenues toward world peace.

Today, such is not the case. Bogged down in a war in Vietnam that we cannot seem to win, and cannot afford to lose, the United States is forfeiting the initiative of global leadership. Caught in a web of conflicting official statements and erroneous forecasts, the administration has sown the seeds of doubt amongst our allies, and miscalculation amongst our enemies, and confusion here at home.

Not only have ambivalence and political posturing in foreign policy cost the administration the credibility of many Americans, it is all too clear they threaten to alienate many of our strongest supporters around the world. When in one breath, the administration announces to the United Nations a bold new offer for peace in Vietnam, and in the other discloses a massive buildup of warmaking materiel, it is understandable if many should question our actual aims.

Here, Mr. President, of course, I refer to the speech made by Ambassador Goldberg, which certainly reasserted in clear language our peaceful intent in the southeast Asian dilemma.

But, Mr. President, our timing is so bad: That same day the Secretary of Defense held a conference to announce that we were tripling our aircraft production for purposes of war in Vietnam.

I do not criticize our getting all the aircraft that we need in Vietnam. But why should this announcement have been made on the same day that Ambassador Goldberg made his speech? It smears the credibility of the U.S. Government all over the world.

The success or failure of American foreign policy does not depend alone upon the imagination and diligence of its architects, and the assurance by the administration that our objectives are sound. Its success or failure is also determined by the degree of respect engendered in friend and foe alike. And let no one confuse popularity for respect. Popularity never won a war, nor can it ever secure the peace.

Mr. President, the prestige issue has been up for debate from time to time. Let us remember that prestige is based upon respect, and not upon popularity.

Sources intimately familiar with Government public opinion polls tell me that disturbing evidence exists that respect for U.S. foreign policy has tumbled in the last 2 years. Particularly dangerous is the fact that the worst slippage appears among the nations of Western Europe, considered by many Americans as our most reliable allies in time of crisis.

In the USIA's second world survey, dated May 1964 and declassified this year in accordance with the Moss agreement, approximately 53 percent of those polled in Great Britain, Italy, West Germany, and France had a "favorable" opinion of U.S. foreign policy. At that time, less than 13 percent viewed American international actions as "unfavorable," and a substantial number, 35 percent, expressed no opinion.

Mr. President, I comment on the so-called Moss agreement. The distinguished Representative from the State of California, Mr. Moss, the head of the Subcommittee on Government Operations, has been interested in the disclosure of all Government business that can be disclosed.

I personally think that, had the election in 1960 gone the other way, the Moss agreement might have been more difficult to obtain. At any rate, it was obtained. It says that a document classified confidential in this policy area shall be published after 2 years, and a document classified for official use only shall be published after 1 year.

Today, according to absolutely reliable sources, while the "favorable" reply has lost little ground, the formerly uncommitted public has moved as a bloc in opposition to our Government's policies. Polling figures taken early this year show that the "unfavorable" reaction has more than doubled since the second world survey, and I have no doubt that, should the administration release the very latest figures now available to USIA, the "unfavorable" element would show

an alarming increase in the past few months alone.

The 1964 USIA report admitted "some trailing off from 1963" in the number of Europeans who support U.S. policy. My informants now tell me that the trend toward open hostility had become so apparent during 1965 that plans for a fourth world survey, to be completed this year and declassified in the 1968 election year, were promptly canceled.

The fact is that preoccupation with the war in Vietnam is rapidly causing one of the basic underpinnings of American foreign policy—our NATO alliance—to disintegrate. Complete disruption of our European relationships, and the trend is in that direction, would be a disastrous blow to American foreign policy objectives, hopes for peace with progress.

While the world surveys have been discontinued, albeit for political reasons, the USIA continues to compile piecemeal figures on the public acceptance of American foreign policy abroad. While the American public is kept in the dark about tax-supported public opinion polls, former USIA Director Carl Rowan writes that United States and British officials recently met to discuss a poll showing that most Britons believe the Soviet Union is now leading in the space race.

From my own experience as an Assistant Secretary of State, I strongly believe in the necessity to keep abreast of foreign opinion in order to evaluate present and to formulate future overseas policies and programs. I was disturbed to learn of the discontinuance of the world surveys, because I believe the first three surveys provided much valuable information for the effective conduct of our role as free world leader.

I say again that prestige should be based on respect and not necessarily on popularity. I do not care whether a poll shows that we are popular or unpopular. But let us see that what we are doing is receiving respect in the world.

But I also believe that one of the firmest foundations of American foreign policy ought to be unified support from the American people. I believe that the administration does itself and our national objectives disservice by leaking information when it is good, and suppressing it when it is bad. I think, for example, that the administration would realize substantially more understanding of its involvement in Vietnam if it dealt with the effects of this involvement upon our allies in Europe with candor and frankness.

The continued suppression of official Government polling information raises far more questions than would their disclosure. For instance, I am sure that millions of Americans saw a news item in early June reporting that a public opinion poll in Saigon showed that the great majority of Vietnamese now consider the conflict in their country to be "an American war." I understand that the Japanese hold similar views and that this is largely responsible for the omission of Japan from the President's forthcoming trip to the Far East.

The present USIA Director, Leonard Marks, has stated that foreign public opinion surveys are "of little value." I strongly agree. Incidentally, he made this statement before the appropriate subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. I am convinced that the current disarray in the President's consensus could be mended if the administration would release to the public the results of the third world survey.

Mr. President, the American people have the right, and the need, to know the full facts about the success and failure of our foreign policy efforts. Only if they are given the complete story can they be expected to give their complete support. Only with conviction can we have consensus.

THIRTY-DAY LEAVE FOR MEMBER OF UNIFORMED SERVICE WHO VOLUNTARILY EXTENDS HIS TOUR OF DUTY IN A HOSTILE FIRE AREA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15748) to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize a special 30-day period of leave for a member of a uniformed service who voluntarily extends his tour of duty in a hostile fire area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, although it may appear to be unpopular to oppose any legislative proposal that supposedly benefits members of the armed services in Vietnam, I, nevertheless, strongly object to the passage of the pending bill, which would authorize a special 30-day leave period for a member of the Armed Forces who voluntarily extends his tour of duty in Vietnam.

The report from the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives which accompanied the pending bill states under the caption "Fiscal Data":

> The number of individuals who might volunteer for extended tours in the program is speculative, but it is not expected to constitute more than a small percentage of the numbers whose normal tours are expiring.

In my opinion, the persons who are most likely to take advantage of the offer contained in the pending bill of 30-day leave and the purchase of round-trip transportation to the United States, or to another place of the individual's choice, are those who have relatively safe and relatively pleasant duty in Vietnam.

Even in a combat zone, we all know that not all jobs are hazardous. I contend that the great majority of servicemen who will take advantage of the pending bill will be those enlisted men and officers who are presently working in air-conditioned offices and headquarters in Saigon, in post exchanges, in officers' clubs and noncommissioned officers' clubs, or engaged in other noncombat activities at Saigon, where more than 30,000 of our GI's are presently housed, in Camranh Bay, and in other places comparatively safe from the firepower of the enemy.

I doubt very much that many of our fighting men, who are pursuing the Vietcong on the ground—in the dense jungles, the steaming rice paddies, and in the mountains of Vietnam—will be lured into extending their service in Vietnam by the carrot of a 30-day extra furlough with their transportation back home, or to any other place they choose, to be paid for by the Government.

Those fighting men who volunteered to risk their lives with an extra tour of duty in Vietnam did so out of a sense of moral duty or conscience or patriotism, not for material benefits. Those who will so volunteer in the future will do so for the same reasons.

While many servicemen would benefit from the proposed bill, in reality this bill, if enacted, would encourage only a small portion of the fighting men who would not have done so otherwise to volunteer for an additional tour of duty in Vietnam.

Another objection I have to this bill could be registered against many similar bills that Congress has considered during the present session. There seems to be a tendency to fragment the Armed Forces benefits system. Bill after bill proposes to extend fringe benefits of one kind or another to members of the Armed Forces. The cost of each such bill is relatively insignificant, but cumulatively the cost is very great. At the same time, the benefits extended are quickly taken for granted and discounted in the reckoning of the benefits of a military career. I am inclined to believe that this kind of fragmentation of fringe benefits is a poor substitute for a really substantial increase in basic pay, and that the fringe bills really militate against an objective consideration of what military pay should be.

In my considered judgment, this bill should be defeated.

The Committee on Armed Services improved the bill that came over from the House by inserting a provision fixing a termination date of this bill, if enacted, of June 30, 1968. That this was done in the Senate committee is evidence that there was considerable doubt as to the merit of the bill. A shutoff date of June 30, 1968, was provided, so that whatever harm is done by the enactment of this bill will be stopped at that time. I predict that if we are unfortunate enough to still be in combat in Vietnam at that time, the provisions of the bill then will be extended, and will constitute a precedent that may recur to plague us in other areas at other times. There is no precedent in the law pertaining to the armed services for the enactment of this bill.

We know that the French, in their disastrous experience in Indochina—which consisted of Vietnam, which we now call North and South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia—relied only on their regular troops and on their mercenaries.

Persons drafted into the French army were not sent to Vietnam against their will. However, this bill, if enacted, seems to me a step in the direction of encouraging a mercenary sort of approach to our military manpower requirements in Vietnam.

The passage of this bill will not provide any material benefit in our involvement in the miserable civil war in Vietnam, and I urge the Senate to reject this bill in its present form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I intend to proceed further, and to refer to the hearing on this bill in the Senate Armed Services Committee. The hearing was very inadequate. It consisted of only one witness—Gen. William Berg, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Military Personnel Policy, who stated that under present statutes, the Department of Defense has no authority to provide the transportation home for servicemen in Vietnam who wish to extend their tours there and both leave and travel time would be chargeable to leave earned by the usual formula.

Hence, he said, there are some individuals who are in Vietnam who must be returned earlier than the completion of their 1-year tours of duty because of the expiration of their service contracts. In these cases, he said, reenlistment or extension of enlistment while in Vietnam would be a significant contribution to the operation. It would provide continuity in certain assignments. He spoke of personal dedication to the mission if the period of service could be broken into segments. He also stated that it is not possible to estimate the numbers of men who would qualify for this leave, and that this special leave would be an incentive only to those men who desired to continue in the duty, because leave to return always occurs at the end of their tour.

Another bad feature of this bill, Mr. President, is that the bill requires that the Secretary of Defense prescribe the regulations for the administration of the benefit authorized by the bill. General Berg said that these regulations are now in preparation. It was not possible for us to have the benefit of any of those regulations, nor is it possible to furnish the Senate with any details as to them. All we know is that General Berg expressed the hope that there would be a minimum of administrative detail.

Chairman RUSSELL, who is the most knowledgeable man in the Senate with respect to military affairs, then said this:

I have certain misgivings about this type of legislation. Those hostile fire areas include all the men serving on all the ships at sea in that area, do they not?

General BERG. It includes the Navy people who are actually assigned to Vietnam, and that does include the smaller ships, sir, but it does not include the people in the Seventh Fleet.

Then the chairman asked:

How about a carrier that is operating offshore?

General BERG. It would not include them, sir. They are not over there under any standard tour.

Chairman RUSSELL. You mean a man flying an airplane off a carrier is not considered in hostile fire?

General BERG. Yes, sir, he is in hostile fire area; he draws hostile fire pay. He also gets the income tax exclusion, but he is attached to the ship, and he may be in there a period of three or four months and then go off to one of the areas in the local area and then come back in again, but he is not there for a prescribed one-year tour.

Chairman RUSSELL. So, he would not benefit from this bill.

General BERG. That is correct.

Chairman RUSSELL. But a man serving on the ground, in the ground forces of the Air Force up in Thailand would be included.

General BERG. Not in Thailand, because that is not a hostile fire area, sir.

Yet, we all know that practically every bombing mission in which we hit North Vietnam, day after day, comes from our bases in Thailand.

Chairman RUSSELL continued:

How about the people flying out of Thailand?

General BERG. It does not cover them, sir.

Chairman RUSSELL. Well, it is a mighty bad bill. It is worse than I thought. You mean, a man flying a plane to attack the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong out of Thailand is not considered covered by the hostile—Well, I will not press you on that. I am reminded that it is supposed to be classified information, although the Assistant Secretary of Defense testified about it in open hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee a few days ago.

General BERG. Those people do receive hostile fire pay.

Then, the following question was asked by Chairman RUSSELL, and this perhaps goes to the heart of the real reason for the bill:

Well, how about a man that is working in an office in Saigon?

General BERG. Any person who is stationed in Vietnam or in the waters within a twelve-mile limit, I think it is, where the tour is precisely one year, would be covered by this bill.

Chairman RUSSELL. Unfortunately, a large percentage * * * (of them) are not engaged in combat at any time, and they will benefit by this just as much as the man who stays up there in the rice paddy, getting shot at all day.

Mr. President, very likely the motivation behind the bill is to encourage officers and enlisted men in our air-conditioned offices in Saigon and in other relatively safe areas—men who are not in constant danger, not in combat, not flying helicopters, and not really engaged in combat—to take advantage of the bill. They will benefit, and this will benefit our generals over there in headquarters because then they will have a continuity of clerks and other personnel who would get this extra bonus.

In the Armed Services Committee hearing, Senator SALTONSTALL questioned General Berg regarding the eligibility of helicopter pilots for the benefits of the proposed bill:

How about a helicopter pilot?

General BERG. I am not sure about the helicopter pilots in the Army, but as a general rule there are a number of missions that are prescribed when a tour ends, particularly the pilots who are going to bomb in North Vietnam.

They would not benefit from this bill, unless they were assigned for a specific 12-month tour of duty.

Senator SALTONSTALL asked further:

I am informed by our experts this is a new step in our war efforts. Neither in World War II, nor World War I, nor in Korea have we ever had this type of extended leave as an inducement for further service. Do you agree with that?

General BERG. That is correct, Senator.

Mr. President, there is no precedent whatever for the proposed legislation.

Chairman RUSSELL then spoke again and said:

There is no doubt in my mind as to what that section says. The thing that confuses me is the application of it to, for illustration, naval pilots who are posted in the area for four months and then go out and then come back after two months and stay for four more months. They break their 12-month continuity. Some of them have not had leave for a long time, 13 or 14 months, back home. But they would not be entitled to this extra month of leave, because the ship was not stationed there for as long as 12 months at one time, if I understand General Berg.

General BERG. That is right, sir.

Chairman RUSSELL. Well, that is a very serious defect in the bill.

Mr. President, it seems to me that when this bill has this serious defect—to name only one—and that is apparent to Chairman RUSSELL of the Committee on Armed Services, and in view of the fact that Congress will adjourn shortly, that we should defeat this bill, or postpone it for further study and bring it up next year.

The question was then asked by Senator STENNIS:

But I want to ask you, sir: This applies, as I understand it, to all enlisted men, such as enlisted men who are doing manual labor, you might say, at Cam Ranh Bay?

General BERG. Yes, sir.

Senator YOUNG. Far from the fighting front, really.

General BERG. Yes, sir.

Then, I asked:

But someone who is working in an office in Saigon, in an air-conditioned office, would be included.

General BERG. Yes, sir.

Senator YOUNG. And also out of Guam we are daily sending very devastating raids over those parts of Vietnam, and those airmen and pilots would not be included under this bill.

General BERG. That is correct, Senator. The tour in Guam, as a matter of information, is not a 12-month tour. There are dependents stationed in Guam, and the tour there is a 24-month tour.

Senator YOUNG. But in Thailand, it is a 12-month tour.

General BERG. That is correct, sir.

Senator YOUNG. And there are many enlisted men there at the present time.

General BERG. Yes, sir, that is right.

Then, near the end of our short hearing Chairman RUSSELL asked:

Chairman RUSSELL. There have been some exceptional cases where men have voluntarily extended their tour of duty in Vietnam past the 12 months, have there not?

General BERG. And those people are people in the grade of Colonel and above, sir.

Chairman RUSSELL. You would not permit it for a noncommissioned officer?

General BERG. No, sir.

Mr. President, I have been a private in the Armed Forces of our country, and I have been an officer during the 37 months I was on duty in World War II. I am telling you, Mr. President, and you know it from your own experience, it is a great deal easier to be an officer than a private in time of war.

Chairman RUSSELL ascertained that when men volunteered to extend their tours of duty in Vietnam voluntarily in

the past 12 months, it was permitted only for those people with the rank of colonel and above. When he asked if it would be permitted of noncommissioned officers the answer was "No." They must just come back to the United States and then volunteer to go over a second time.

Mr. President, I have presented some of my objections to the bill. For these reasons I think it would be unfortunate to have this bill passed at this time, and I urge that it be defeated.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I rise to support the pending legislation. It seems to me it would be helpful to our military commanders in Vietnam, in the normal tour of duty in the hostile fire area.

The purpose of this legislation would be to encourage those who have completed a year in a hostile fire area to reenlist for 6 months. If those who desire voluntary reenlistment are encouraged to take that action, they would be granted an additional 30 days' leave.

Many of those positions are technical positions. It takes quite a while to train officers and men to do the job. A year goes by rather rapidly and replacements must be found.

This legislation was asked for and encouraged by General Westmoreland as a means of trying to keep men there on a voluntary basis, men who have had valuable training and who will be great assets to our military endeavor in southeast Asia.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this bill is a fair and appropriate proposal. I hope that the Senate will enact it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. DOMINICK in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, there are a few statements which have been made in this debate which I believe should be answered.

The question was raised concerning the additional cost to the Government. Let me point out that there is no additional cost to the Government involved. It would be an incentive and a saving to the Government by keeping a man who is trained in a particular position, after he has had his 30-day leave and returns.

I point out that when a man comes to the end of his tour of duty, the Government must transport him at Government expense back to the United States and then transport his replacement out to Vietnam at Government expense, so it is more or less an even trade, assuming the man desires to return to the United States for his 30-day leave, which is provided in the bill.

The statement has also been made that there was only one witness who testified in support of the bill. That is true. General Berg testified in behalf of the Department of Defense, representing the entire Defense agency.

The statement was made, "Yes, but it is not needed." The bill was requested by our commander in the field, General Westmoreland. He is the man to whom the President and the Department of Defense have entrusted the entire conduct of the Vietnam operation. General Westmoreland has requested that this legislation be enacted, so that it would help him do his job better. I read from the testimony of General Berg, as follows:

> General Westmoreland has repeatedly said that he would like to be able to take some small number of people who are dedicated to their mission and whom he needed and be able to say to them, "If you will extend, we will authorize you to go home on leave and pay your transportation and when you come back we will have an additional period of time here."

That, exactly, is the essence of the entire bill.

Certainly it will be an incentive to get those people back whom the military commander desires to have in the field, those men who have demonstrated their capabilities, and give them some additional incentive to return and assist in this very difficult job to be done in Vietnam.

The statement was also made that the distinguished chairman of our committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], had grave misgivings about the bill. That was the statement of the Senator from Georgia. But let me point out that, apparently, those misgivings have been satisfied. The distinguished chairman is now in the Chamber and he can speak for himself; for, in the end, he voted for the bill when it came out of committee. There was only one dissenting vote and that was the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], who has already spoken against the bill on the the floor of the Senate.

The question was raised, to whom would the bill apply.

Mr. President, it would apply both to officers and to enlisted men, provided they are serving in South Vietnam and serving there under the 1-year tour of duty.

The question was raised that it would not apply to pilots off aircraft carriers or to helicopter pilots. That is true. Pilots are assigned on a mission basis. The aircraft carrier is also on a mission basis and does not stay in Vietnam waters for a period of 1 year; it is rotated for a shorter period. So that there is no point telling the pilot on an aircraft carrier, "If you sign up for an additional period and are willing to come back, we are going to give you this incentive," because he is on the carrier and probably long since gone before the year's operation has been completed.

Helicopter pilots are under a similar situation. They are not there under a year's tour. Generally, they are all under a mission tour. If they were there for a year or two, the bill would apply to them.

It would not apply to Thailand, as has been stated; it relates specifically to Vietnam. People on the ground in Thailand are not subject to the same rigors or the same hazards as those who are in Vietnam.

Thus, Mr. President, I submit that this is purely and simply an incentive bill, one which has been requested by General Westmoreland, our highest commander in that field of operation, a bill which he thinks will permit him to do his job better.

I therefore urge the Senate to enact this bill into law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. INOUYE. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER and Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is detained on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senators from KANSAS [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER and Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 2, as follows:

[No. 294 Leg.]

YEAS—68

Aiken	Hartke	Murphy
Bartlett	Hill	Muskie
Bayh	Holland	Nelson
Bennett	Hruska	Neuberger
Bible	Inouye	Pastore
Boggs	Jackson	Pell
Brewster	Javits	Proxmire
Burdick	Jordan, N.C.	Ribicoff
Byrd, Va.	Kennedy, Mass.	Robertson
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy, N.Y.	Russell, Ga.
Cannon	Long, Mo.	Saltonstall
Clark	Magnuson	Scott
Cotton	Mansfield	Simpson
Dodd	McCarthy	Smathers
Dominick	McClellan	Smith
Ellender	McGee	Sparkman
Ervin	McGovern	Stennis
Fannin	Mondale	Symington
Fong	Monroney	Talmadge
Fulbright	Montoya	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Morton	Williams, Del.
Harris	Moss	Young, N. Dak.
Hart	Mundt	

NAYS—2

Morse	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—30

Allott	Eastland	Metcalf
Anderson	Griffin	Miller
Bass	Gruening	Pearson
Carlson	Hayden	Prouty
Case	Hickenlooper	Randolph
Church	Jordan, Idaho	Russell, S.C.
Cooper	Kuchel	Thurmond
Curtis	Lausche	Tower
Dirksen	Long, La.	Tydings
Douglas	McIntyre	Yarborough

So the bill (H.R. 15748) was passed.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that Mr. HALPERN, of New York, and Mr. HARVEY of Michigan had been appointed as conferees at the conference of the two Houses on the bill (S. 3158) to strengthen the regulatory and supervisory authority of Federal agencies over insured banks and insured savings and loan associations, and for other purposes, vice Mr. FINO, of New York, and Mrs. DWYER, of New Jersey, excused.

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3809) to authorize the Public Printer to print for and deliver to the General Services Administration an additional copy of certain publications.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3035) to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 3112) to amend the Clean Air Act so as to authorize grants to air pollution control agencies for maintenance of air pollution control programs in addition to present authority for grants to develop, establish, or improve such programs; make the use of appropriations under the act more flexible by consolidating the appropriation authorizations under the act and deleting the provision limiting the total of grants for support of air pollution control programs to 20 percent of the total appropriation for any year; extend the duration of the programs authorized by the act; and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. JARMAN, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. SPRINGER, and Mr. NELSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1665) to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in special jurisdictional cases, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17637) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SIKES, Mr. MCFALL, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MAHON, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. JONAS, and Mr. Bow were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 14363. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide rules relating to the deduction for personal exemptions for children of parents who are divorced or separated; and

H.R. 16394. An act for the relief of certain enlisted members of the military services who lost interest on amounts deposited under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, or prior laws authorizing enlisted members' deposits, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 14363. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide rules relating to the deduction for personal exemptions for children of parents who are divorced or separated; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 16394. An act for the relief of certain enlisted members of the military services who lost interest on amounts deposited under section 1035 of title 10, United State Code, or prior laws authorizing enlisted members' deposits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROGRAM FOR PRESERVATION OF ADDITIONAL HISTORIC PROPERTIES

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 3035, to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3035) to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

The Congress finds and declares—

(a) that the spirit and direction of the Nation are founded upon and reflected in its historic past;

(b) that the historical and cultural foundations of the Nation should be preserved as a living part of our community life and development in order to give a sense of orientation to the American people;

(c) that, in the face of ever-increasing extensions of urban centers, highways, and residential, commercial, and industrial developments, the present governmental and nongovernmental historic preservation programs and activities are inadequate to insure future generations a genuine opportunity to appreciate and enjoy the rich heritage of our Nation; and

(d) that, although the major burdens of historic preservation have been borne and major efforts initiated by private agencies and individuals, and both should continue to play a vital role, it is nevertheless necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to accelerate its historic preservation programs and activities, to give maximum encouragement to agencies and individuals undertaking preservation by private means, and to assist State and local governments and the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States to expand and accelerate their historic preservation programs and activities.

TITLE I

SEC. 101. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized—

(1) to expand and maintain a national register of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archeology, and culture, hereinafter referred to as the National Register, and to grant funds to States for the purpose of preparing comprehensive statewide historic surveys and plans, in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary, for the preservation, acquisition, and development of such properties;

(2) to establish a program of matching grants-in-aid to States for projects having as their purpose the preservation for public benefit of properties that are significant in American history, architecture, archeology, and culture; and

(3) to establish a program of matching grant-in-aid to the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States, chartered by act of Congress approved October 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 927), as amended, for the purpose of carrying out the responsibilities of the National Trust.

(b) As used in this Act—

(1) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States of the Union, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

(2) The term "project" means programs of State and local governments and other public bodies and private organizations and individuals for the acquisition of title or interests in, and for the development of, any district, site, building, structure, or object that is significant in American history, architecture, archeology, and culture, or property used in connection therewith, and for its development in order to assure the preservation for public benefit of any such historical properties.

(3) The term "historic preservation" includes the protection, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archeology, or culture.

(4) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 102. (a) No grant may be made under this Act—

(1) unless application therefor is submitted to the Secretary in accordance with regulations and procedures prescribed by him;

(2) unless the application is in accordance with the comprehensive statewide historic preservation plan which has been approved by the Secretary after considering its relationship to the comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plan prepared pursuant to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897);

(3) for more than 50 per centum of the total cost involved, as determined by the Secretary and his determination shall be final;

(4) unless the grantee has agreed to make such reports, in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may from time to time require;

(5) unless the grantee has agreed to assume, after completion of the project, the total cost of the continued maintenance, repair, and administration of the property in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary; and

(6) until the grantee has complied with such further terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem necessary or advisable.

(b) The Secretary may in his discretion waive the requirements of subsection (a), paragraphs (2) and (5) of this section for any grant under this Act to the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States, in which case a grant to the National Trust may include funds for the maintenance, repair, and administration of the property in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary.

(c) No State shall be permitted to utilize the value of real property obtained before the date of approval of this Act in meeting the remaining cost of a project for which a grant is made under this Act.

SEC. 103. (a) The amounts appropriated and made available for grants to the States for comprehensive statewide historic surveys and plans under this Act shall be apportioned among the States by the Secretary on the basis of needs as determined by him: *Provided, however,* That the amount granted to any one State shall not exceed 50 per centum of the total cost of the comprehensive statewide historic survey and plan for that State, as determined by the Secretary.

(b) The amounts appropriated and made available for grants to the States for projects under this Act for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the States by the Secretary in accordance with needs as disclosed in approved statewide historic preservation plans.

The Secretary shall notify each State of its apportionment, and the amounts thereof shall be available thereafter for payment to such State for projects in accordance with the provisions of this Act. Any amount of any apportionment that has not been paid or obligated by the Secretary during the fiscal year in which such notification is given, and for two fiscal years thereafter, shall be reapportioned by the Secretary in accordance with this subsection.

SEC. 104. (a) No grant may be made by the Secretary for or on account of any survey or project under this Act with respect to which financial assistance has been given or promised under any other Federal program or activity, and no financial assistance may be given under any other Federal program or activity for or on account of any survey or project with respect to which assistance has been given or promised under this Act.

(b) In order to assure consistency in policies and actions under this Act with other related Federal programs and activities, and to assure coordination of the planning acquisition, and development assistance to States under this Act with other related Federal programs and activities, the President may issue such regulations with respect thereto as he deems desirable, and such assistance may be provided only in accordance with such regulations.

SEC. 105. The beneficiary of assistance under this Act shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the disposition by the beneficiary of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

SEC. 106. The head of any Federal agency having direct or indirect jurisdiction over a proposed Federal or federally assisted undertaking in any State and the head of any Federal department or independent agency having authority to license any undertaking shall, prior to the approval of the expenditure of any Federal funds on the undertaking or prior to the issuance of any license, as the case may be, take into account the effect of the undertaking on any district, site, building, structure, or object that is included in the National Register. The head of any such Federal agency shall afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation established under title II of this Act a reasonable opportunity to comment with regard to such undertaking.

SEC. 107. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to be applicable to the White House and its grounds, the Supreme Court building and its grounds, or the United States Capitol and its related buildings and grounds.

SEC. 108. There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $2,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act for the fiscal year 1967, and not more than $10,000,000 for each of the three succeeding fiscal years. Such appropriations shall be available for the financial assistance authorized by this title and for the administrative expenses of the Secretary in connection therewith, and shall remain available until expended.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. (a) There is established an Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (hereinafter referred to as the "Council") which shall be composed of seventeen members as follows:

(1) The Secretary of the Interior.

(2) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(3) The Secretary of Commerce.

(4) The Administrator of the General Services Administration.

(5) The Secretary of the Treasury.

(6) The Attorney General.

(7) The Chairman of the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

(8) Ten appointed by the President from outside the Federal Government. In making these appointments, the President shall give due consideration to the selection of officers of State and local governments and individuals who are significantly interested and experienced in the matters to be considered by the Council.

(b) Each member of the Council specified in paragraph (1) through (6) of subsection (a) may designate another officer of his department or agency to serve on the Council in his stead.

(c) Each member of the Council appointed under paragraph (8) of subsection (a) shall serve for a term of five years from the expiration of his predecessor's term; except that the members first appointed under that paragraph shall serve for terms of from one to five years, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, in such manner as to insure that the terms of not less than one nor more than two of them will expire in any one year.

(d) A vacancy in the Council shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment (and for the balance of the unexpired term).

(e) The Chairman of the Council shall be designated by the President.

(f) Eight members of the Council shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 202. (a) The Council shall—

(1) advise the President and the Congress on matters relating to historic preservation; recommend measures to coordinate activities of Federal, State, and local agencies and private institutions and individuals relating to historic preservation; and advise on the dissemination of information pertaining to such activities;

(2) encourage, in cooperation with the National Trust for Historic Preservation and appropriate private agencies, public interest and participation in historic preservation;

(3) recommend the conduct of studies in such areas as the adequacy of legislative and administrative statutes and regulations pertaining to historic preservation activities of State and local governments and the effects of tax policies at all levels of government on historic preservation;

(4) advise as to guidelines for the assistance of State and local governments in drafting legislation relating to historic preservation; and

(5) encourage, in cooperation with appropriate public and private agencies and institutions, training and education in the field of historic preservation.

(b) The Council shall submit annually a comprehensive report of its activities and the results of its studies to the President and the Congress and shall from time to time submit such additional and special reports as it deems advisable. Each report shall propose such legislative enactments and other actions as, in the judgment of the Council, are necessary and appropriate to carry out its recommendations.

SEC. 203. The Council is authorized to secure directly from any department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment or instrumentality of the executive branch of the Federal Government information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this title; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, offices, independent establishment or instrumentality is authorized to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics to the extent permitted by law and within available funds.

SEC. 204. The members of the Council specified in paragraphs (1) through (7) of section 201(a) shall serve without additional compensation. The members of the Council appointed under paragraph (8) of section 201(a) shall receive $100 per diem when engaged in the performance of the duties of the Council. All members of the Council shall receive reimbursement for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties of the Council.

SEC. 205. (a) The Director of the National Park Service or his designee shall be the Executive Director of the Council. Financial and administrative services (including those related to budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, personnel and procurement) shall be provided the Council by the Department of the Interior, for which payments shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement, from funds of the Council in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Chairman of the

Council and the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the regulations of the Department of the Interior for the collection of indebtedness of personnel resulting from erroneous payments (5 U.S.C. 46e) shall apply to the collection of erroneous payments made to or on behalf of a Council employee, and regulations of said Secretary for the administrative control of funds (31 U.S.C. 665 (g)) shall apply to appropriations of the Council: *And provided further*, That the Council shall not be required to prescribe such regulations.

(b) The Council shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such additional personnel as may be necessary to carry out its duties, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949.

(c) The Council may also procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the executive departments by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

(d) The members of the Council specified in paragraphs (1) through (6) of section 201(a) shall provide the Council, on a reimbursable basis, with such facilities and services under their jurisdiction and control as may be needed by the Council to carry out it duties, to the extent that such facilities and services are requested by the Council and are otherwise available for that purpose. To the extent of available appropriations, the Council may obtain, by purchase, rental, donation, or otherwise, such additional property, facilities, and services as may be needed to carry out its duties.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO WATCHES AND CLOCKS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1647, H.R. 8436.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8436) to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the dutiable status of watches, clocks, and timing apparatus from insular possessions of the United States.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule of germaneness be waived for the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS].

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

NATIONAL MUSEUM OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1310) relating to the National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report see House proceedings of October 5, 1966, p. 25304, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

CORRECTION IN ENROLLMENT OF SENATE BILL 1310

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in connection with S. 1310, I should like to submit a concurrent resolution which would merely authorize the Secretary of the Senate to make a pro forma correction in the text. It would simply change the date of the act from 1965 to 1966.

I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by the clerk.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 112), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (S. 1310) relating to the National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution, the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to make section 1 read: "That this Act may be cited as the 'National Museum Act of 1966'."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, for myself and Senators BAYH, BREWSTER, CLARK, GRUENING, INOUYE, KENNEDY of New York, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, KUCHEL, MANSFIELD, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, MCGOVERN, MONDALE, MONRONEY, MUSKIE, NELSON, PASTORE, RIBICOFF, TYDINGS, and YARBOROUGH, I send to the desk a bill to provide for the establishment of a National Foundation for the Social Sciences.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill first be referred to the Senate Committee on Government Operations and then to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, last year, accompanied by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], I made an extensive trip to four Latin American countries—Chile, Peru, Argentina, and Brazil. As a result of that trip, I became convinced that, among other things, there is a great need to "civilianize" the image of the United States in Latin America.

My trip to Latin America was in the wake of the so-called Camelot project, under which the U.S. Army financed a comprehensive study of Chilean social and socioeconomic factors of change and revolution in that country. As is well known now, Camelot was planned without the knowledge or approval of our U.S. Ambassador in Chile or the host country. It caused considerable bad publicity for the United States and was damaging to our image throughout Latin America.

Last February, speaking on the floor of the Senate, I called attention to a similar project, also financed by the U.S. Army, Project Simpatico in Colombia. As I pointed out then, after Camelot the President of the United States had instituted procedures in the State Department to assure that any such research project would not be carried forward except with the knowledge and consent of our country team and the local officials in the host country. These procedures had been followed in Project Simpatico. But, the resulting publicity in Colombia and Latin America from Project Simpatico once again emphasized the need to civilianize such social and behavioral science research in foreign countries.

In that speech on the floor of the Senate last February, I, therefore, stated:

> I feel there is no reason why the bulk of such expenditures should be from the Department of Defense budget. Such foreign research expenditures—by direct appropriation or by transfer of funds—must be placed under institutionalized civilian control.

Since the time of that speech the Subcommittee on Government Research, which I chair, has held extensive hearings on the subject of U.S.-financed social and behavioral science research in foreign countries and on the broader subject of present and needed Federal support of research and scholarship in the social and behavioral sciences, generally. The bill I introduce is a result of the findings in those hearings.

We need an additional civilian agency for Federal support of research in the social and behavioral sciences, both here and abroad.

We have made great breakthroughs of knowledge in the natural sciences, but our understanding of man, himself, has not increased proportionately.

Man can accomplish so many things these days—not excluding world devastation—by merely pushing a button; we understand the button and the machine

very well, but we are woefully weak in the understanding of the button pusher.

As a Member of the Senate, Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, then the senior Senator from Minnesota, in a speech on the floor of the Senate on February 19, 1962, called for greater support for social science research and what he called a Magna Carta for the social sciences. He pointed out at that time, as he has on several other occasions since, our great national need for more social science research, more insights and knowledge about our society. Our hearings have updated and confirmed this need, identified by him.

The bill which I introduce today would provide an extra source of funding for social science research and would give recognition to our continuing and growing need for knowledge and ideas, not only about our own society, but of others as well.

The bill would create a National Foundation for the Social Sciences, similar to the National Science Foundation, to encourage and support research in the social and behavioral sciences. The proposed Foundation would be separate from the operating agencies and departments of the Federal Government which now support policy studies relevant to their missions.

The Foundations would do no in-house research but would, in keeping with the precedent set by the National Science Foundation and the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities, underwrite, fund and support academic research in the fields of political science, economics, psychology, sociology, anthropology, history, law, social statistics, demography, geography, linguistics, international relations, and other social sciences.

The Foundation would be comprised of a Board of Trustees consisting of 25 prominent citizens from the social science community, both academic and practicing. There would, as well, be a Director and a Deputy Director, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, in addition to such staff as the Foundation needs to administer such funds as may be appropriated for these purposes.

The Foundation would: develop a national policy for research and scholarship in the social sciences; support research and programs to strengthen research in the social sciences in the United States, as well as in foreign countries; appropriately assist social scientists where such assistance would lead to strengthening colleges, universities, nonprofit research organizations, and foundations; encourage development of social science capabilities and manpower in all parts of the country.

Further, an important aspect of the proposed Foundation would be its availability as a contracting agency for the operating departments of the Federal Government to use to secure unclassified scholarly research in the social and behavioral science fields, here and in foreign countries.

The bill carries an authorization of $20 million, an arbitrary figure, chosen as a figure to be discussed in hearings, which are planned for next year.

In his speech September 29, 1966, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Brookings Institution, speaking of the ideas fostered by the academic and research community in this country, President Johnson stated:

> Without the tide of new proposals that periodically sweeps into this city, the climate of our government would be arid, indeed.

I agree.

Therefore, Mr. President, so that we may increase our understanding of man, his behavior, his institutions, and his relationships with other men, I introduce this bill to establish a National Foundation for the Social Sciences which will provide funds for study and research in the social and behavioral sciences, both here and abroad, on its own authority and as a civilian subcontractor for mission-oriented U.S. agencies.

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

Mr. HARRIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Oklahoma on the initiative which he has exhibited in this field; and I am happy to have the opportunity to join him in this venture, to establish this study in the area of the social sciences.

I was fortunate enough to have the opportunity to accompany the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma on the visit to the four Latin American countries which he mentioned, and wish to attest to the validity of the judgment and the analysis which he has made of the impact of some of the unfortunate practices which have heretofore been a part of our policy in those countries. I share his concern to see that we do not repeat such mistakes.

With the emphasis we have placed on science, and through the efforts of the various technical schools, we have made vast progress in the areas of the physical and natural sciences. We have, indeed, reached the place where we can foretell the landing of a man on the moon and predict the ultimate conquest of outer space. From a mechanical standpoint, we have made great progress in our ability to look into the depths of a man's heart, even to the point where I suppose it is no longer ridiculous to look forward to the time when the automation of the heart will greatly lengthen the span of human life. The area in which we have not made the type of progress we must make is into a man's mind, to determine what makes him do some of the things he does and why we cannot live together on this earth in more harmony than we have in the past.

I think that the bill that the Senator from Oklahoma is introducing will make a great contribution to the governmental process in our country when it is finally enacted into law.

I commend him for the effort he is making in this area.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from Indiana for his cosponsorship of this bill, for his remarks today, and for his judgment.

I was very proud to accompany him on a tour last year to Latin America.

The Senator from Indiana projects an excellent image of this country wherever he goes. His judgment will be very valuable as we consider the bill next year in committee.

Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma for introducing the bill.

I know of the hard work, the great patience, and leadership shown by the distinguished Senator in the hearings held to appraise the need for this proposal for our country.

I am very proud to join him as a cosponsor.

Because of his leadership, future generations will be indebted to the Senator from Oklahoma for what he has done today.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am greatly honored by the cosponsorship of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, and for his very generous statement made on the floor today.

Nobody understands the needs in the social science field of this country better than does the Senator from Connecticut, who served as a great member of the Cabinet, as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I appreciate what the Senator has had to say and for his support of the bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and referred, as requested earlier by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The bill (S. 3896) to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation for the Social Sciences in order to promote research and scholarship in such sciences, introduced by Mr. HARRIS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. SMATHERS. 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. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT OF THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H.R. 8436) to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the dutiable status of watches, clocks, and timing apparatus from insular possessions of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

> That (a) paragraph (a) of general headnote 3 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. § 1202) is amended—

(1) by striking out "Articles" in subparagraph (i) and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in headnote 6 of schedule 7, part 2, subpart E, articles"; and

(2) by striking out "except that all articles" in subparagraph (i) and inserting in lieu thereof "except that all such articles".

(b) The headnotes of schedule 7, part 2, subpart E of the Tariff Schedules of the United States are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new headnote:

"6. Products of Insular Possessions.—(a) Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this headnote, any article provided for in this subpart which is the product of an insular possession of the United States outside the customs territory of the United States and which contains any foreign component shall be subject to duty—

"(i) at the rates set forth in column numbered 1, if the countries of origin of more than 50 percent in value of the foreign components are countries to products of which column numbered 1 rates apply, and

"(ii) at the rates set forth in column numbered 2, if the countries of origin of 50 per centum or more in value of the foreign components are countries to products of which column numbered 2 rates apply.

"(b) If the requirements for free entry set forth in general headnote 3(a) are complied with, watches (provided for in item 715.05) and watch movements (provided for in items 716.08 through 719) which are the product of the Virgin Islands, Guam, or American Samoa and which contain any foreign component may be admitted free of duty, but the total quantity of such articles entered free of duty during each calendar year shall not exceed a number equal to ⅓ of the apparent United States consumption of watch movements during the preceding calendar year (as determined by the Tariff Commission), of which total quantity—

"(i) not to exceed 87.5 per centum shall be the product of the Virgin Islands,

"(ii) not to exceed 8.33 per centum shall be the product of Guam, and

"(iii) not to exceed 4.17 per centum shall be the product of American Samoa.

"(c) On or before April 1 of each calendar year (beginning with 1967), the Tariff Commission shall determine the apparent United States consumption of watch movements during the preceding calendar year, shall report such determination to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Commerce, and shall publish such determination in the Federal Register, together with the number of watches and watch movements which are the product of the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa which may be entered free of duty under paragraph (b) during the calendar year.

"(d) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce, acting jointly, shall allocate on a fair and equitable basis among producers of watches and watch movements located in the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa the quotas for each calendar year provided by paragraph (b) for articles which are the product of the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa, respectively. Allocations made by the Secretaries shall be final. The Secretaries are authorized to issue such regulations as they determine necessary to carry out their duties under this paragraph."

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply only with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption or or after January 1, 1967.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this bill, as passed by the House of Representatives, was designed to meet a problem that had arisen through the operation of our tariff laws. Under present law, if not more than 50 percent of the total value of an article produced in the insular possessions is of foreign origin, the article may qualify for duty-free treatment—provided it has received some processing in the islands. These duty-free articles vary from ball-point blanks to wine or costume jewelry.

However, the largest by far of the industries which have sprung up in the possessions as a result of this favorable tariff treatment is the watch assembly industry.

This operation was established in the Virgin Islands in 1959 and has since shipped its entire production of watches to the United States free of duty. Its growth is dramatically demonstrated by the fact that from 1959 through 1965, the rate of shipment of watch movements from the Virgin Islands rose from some 5,000 in 1959 to a rate in excess of 4 million movements in 1965—an increase of some 3½ million movements.

The chief suppliers of the parts used in such assembly operations are Japan, West Germany, and France. It is also interesting to note that an increasingly large volume of Soviet-made parts have been utilized in this assembly process.

With a view toward protecting our domestic watch industry, while at the same time not disrupting our possessions' already-established watch assembly industry, the House enacted H.R. 8436. It was designed to stave off greater increases in the shipment of watch movements by prohibiting the described duty-free treatment to watches imported from Guam and American Samoa—possessions who, at the time of House passage, had not established assembly operations. The Virgin Islands, on the other hand, had just enacted a quota law which would have placed a self-imposed limitation on the number of watch movements which could be shipped to the United States, and in recognition of their action, the House excluded that possession from the prohibition.

Since House passage of H.R. 8436, however, several events have occurred to lead the committee to believe that an entirely different approach is needed. The action of the Virgin Islands Legislature to establish a local quota has been declared invalid in the courts. Further, watch-production centers have been established in Guam. And several watch companies had shown interest in locating in American Samoa, although negotiations have been discontinued in light of the proposed prohibition.

The Committee on Finance, therefore, has adjusted the impact of H.R. 8436 to meet these new circumstances.

As reported by the committee, H.R. 8436 would impose a quota on the number of watches and watch movements containing any foreign components which may be imported duty-free from the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa. This quota, based on a calendar year, would be equal to one-ninth of the total U.S. watch consumption for the prior year. It would be divided among the possessions, with the largest share to go to the Virgin Islands in recognition of their already-established watch assembly industry. Specifically, seven-eighths of the quota amount would go to the Virgin Islands and the remaining one-eighth would be divided, two-thirds to Guam and one-third to American Samoa. Based on anticipated U.S. watch consumption in 1966, the number of movements which could be transported to this country duty-free in 1967—the effective date of the committee bill is January 1, 1967—would be 4,083,334 from the Virgin Islands, 388,891 from Guam, and 194,442 from American Samoa. These quotas would be allocated among producers in the possessions by the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Interior, acting jointly.

Mr. President, I believe the bill we have reported goes a long way toward stabilizing the total watch industry and should enable both importers and domestic companies alike to pursue their normal trade patterns without fear of unchecked duty-free importation of watches from the insular possessions. I recommend that H.R. 8436 as reported do pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have an amendment which is at the desk. The amendment is being offered on behalf of myself and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, add a new section:

"SEC. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one variable pressure water channel (one-seventh scale model) imported for the use of the Stevens Institute of Technology, and one ionsonde (and accompanying spare parts) for the use of the University of Illinois.

"(b) If the liquidation of the entry of the articles described in subsection (a) of this section has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty one instrument for the use of the Stevens Institute of Technology, and another instrument for the use of the University of Illinois. Neither of these instruments is manufactured in this country. The Treasury Department has approved this amendment and it was approved this morning by the Committee on Finance, with instructions that it be offered as an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] if this is the amendment we discussed in committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment. These are items not produced in this country. We have no objection to these two items coming in duty free.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr.

WILLIAMS] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. 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. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment as follows:

On page 4, line 3, strike everything after "exceed" through the comma in line 6, and insert in lieu thereof "3,000,000 watches or watch movements";

On page 4, line 7, strike "87.5 percent" and insert in lieu thereof "2,000,000 watches or watch movements";

On page 4, line 9, strike "8.33 percent" and insert in lieu thereof "700,000 watches or watch movements";

On page 4, line 11, strike "4.17 percent" and insert in lieu thereof "300,000 watches or watch movements";

On page 4, strike everything beginning with line 13 through line 23 and renumber subsection (d) as subsection (c).

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am sensible of the fact that this is, to say the least, a very difficult problem.

When the bill was first reported out of the Finance Committee, it called for a quota of 1,500,000 watch movements. There was not too much evidence at the time, because the hearings were rather meager. Subsequently there were full-dress hearings on the matter, and the measure was revised. Notwithstanding that fact, it offered some difficulty. I am fully aware of the difficulty involved when we try to match the interest of domestic producers of watches and those who import from the outside.

A bill to eliminate or curtail duty-free shipments of watches from the Territories is necessary if U.S. watch producers and established watch-importing firms are to exist. This is the purpose of the bill. But the bill does not go far enough to accomplish that purpose. The quota must be smaller.

Duty-free imports from the Territories began as a trickle in 1959—about 50,000. When legislation to control this situation was first introduced in the House, they were flowing in at a rate of 1.5 million. The Department of Commerce figures indicate that they are now flooding in at the rate of over 5 million a year, and still growing.

Substantially all of these 5 million watches are jeweled-lever watches. They place tremendous pressure on our U.S. jeweled watchmakers and on conventional importers as well. In 1965 the importers who paid the regular duty brought in about 8 million jeweled watch movements. Almost half again as many came in duty free from the Virgin Islands—3.57 million. U.S. production of jeweled watches has been pushed back to less than 1.5 million.

As is generally known, U.S. jeweled watch production is having difficulty even against duty-paid imports, because of the much lower foreign labor rates. Adding the pressure from duty-free movements is asking too much. The Tariff Commission's report in 1965 showed that a duty reduction, which the Swiss have been seeking, would be fatal to U.S. watch production. These duty-free shipments from the Virgin Islands and Guam are equivalent to a duty cut.

They should be stopped entirely. This was the sense of the testimony before the Finance Committee for all the U.S. producers and for the great majority of regular importers. The Commerce Department agreed. Only the Territorial governments, the Interior Department, and some of the companies operating in the Virgin Islands and Guam disagreed.

The 1.5 million quota which the committee first approved would have been a reasonable compromise. But the present bill is not a compromise. It gives the Territories more than they need. It is a well-known fact that the Virgin Islands, from which over 90 percent of these watches came, is experiencing a tremendous economic boom, and already has more jobs than workers.

As a matter of fact, they are having to import watchmakers and watch assemblers into the Virgin Islands.

There is no need to destroy this U.S. industry and idle its watchworkers in order to provide more jobs in the Virgin Islands.

I therefore propose as necessary an amendment to reduce the overall quota figure for all territories to 3 million watches per year—divided 2 million to the Virgin Islands, 700,000 to Guam, and 300,000 to Samoa.

For every payroll dollar being spent in the Virgin Islands on watch production the United States is losing $6 in duty. The average duty that would be paid on these watches if imported directly is $3. The labor cost of the work being done in the Virgin Islands is only about 50 cents per movement.

I think there is merit here. The amendment has been modified to meet the desires of the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who has been very much interested in the development of the industry in the islands.

This is an amendment that speaks for the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] as well as myself. I think it is wholly satisfactory.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the committee first ordered a bill reported that was even more restrictive than provided by the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. It was suggested then by a member of the committee that the matter should be studied in greater depth. We conducted hearings on the subject and then reconsidered it in executive session. The bill as it has been reported reflects the experience that developed at the hearing, which I think points up the defect of and the reason why the amendment of the Senator from Illinois should not be agreed to.

I do not argue against the fact that it costs us nearly $6 in duty for every $1 of labor spent in the Virgin Islands on watch assembly. To me it would make better sense, rather than adopt the amendment, to take the duties off all of the watches produced in the possessions and let them come into this country free of duty, because American manufacturers cannot compete with jeweled watches manufactured by the Swiss and the Japanese.

A spokesman for the Hamilton Watch Co., as appears on page 67 of the hearings, pointed out that if we cut out all production in the Virgin Islands and Guam, these watches would not be produced in the United States, but would be produced in Switzerland and Japan.

As a practical matter, unless we wanted to raise the tariff drastically, it is beyond our power to restore the American watch industry to what it was. This is something I had nothing to do with. The people who produce watches have seen what has happened.

I have no particular interest in the matter, but the facts, from the testimony, show that it would not help the American watch producers in this country; that the watches would come from Japan and Switzerland.

All that would be achieved by adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Illinois would be to substitute Swiss and Japanese watches for watches made in Guam and the Virgin Islands.

I hold no particular brief for Guam or the Virgin Islands. I have not been to either place. I would not know a Guamanian or a Virgin Islander if I ran into one on the street right now. But, as a practical matter, those are American possessions and we have a responsibility to those possessions.

The bill represents somewhat of a cutback in production of the Virgin Islands. It holds the production of Guam to about where it is. This is the best judgment of the committee as to the way to handle the matter.

I have no great interest in it one way or the other. I fear—and I think I am correct in this fear—that if the amendment were agreed to, it would not result in one more American job, but would cost the Virgin Islands and Guam many jobs.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the point the Senator makes about how important it is that we permit industries of this kind to develop in the underdeveloped possessions of the United States is a very

important one. The process does not require any highly skilled labor; it is a very elementary process. We are not denying opportunity to skilled American workers, because this is highly unskilled work.

Unless we permit industries of this kind to be developed in the possessions of the United States—and I would even go beyond that, and think we ought to look for ways of opening up opportunities of this kind in some of the countries of Latin America that are so dependent upon us—I fear the alternative is simply to give them aid, unless we can buy enough sugar from them; and we can only buy so much sugar from Central America.

That reminds me, Mr. President, of what Mr. Dooley said back about 1900, after we had taken over most of the countries of the Caribbean. He said if he had to make a choice between being subject to a Spanish nobleman and an American vegetable—talking about the sugarbeet—he thought he would take the Spanish nobleman.

This provision would work toward the diversification of the industries upon which Americans in the Caribbean and in the Pacific depend for livelihood. While it represents an arbitrary decision, I think it is as good as any other arbitrary recommendation we have received.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I am willing, even though we produce no watches in the State I have the honor to represent, to vote for something to save the American watch industry. The pending amendment would not do it; but on the other hand, the committee amendment would not hurt that industry either. The committee amendment seeks merely to maintain the status quo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in behalf of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] I submit an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, after the word "respectively" in line 5, insert the following:

Any producer, licensed to do business before July 1, 1966 and having theretofore made a substantial investment in plant and production facilities and related costs, shall not be disadvantaged in its allocation for lack of actual production experience prior to January 1, 1967.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the amendment is very simple. There is a corporation out in Guam called the Sheraton Times Corp. The investment in that corporation was made mainly by citizens of the State of New York. It was organized for the purpose of assembling watch movements from foreign parts, for duty-free entry into the United States under headnote 3(a) of the Tariff Schedules of the United States. Incorporation under Guam law occurred 10 months ago on December 9, 1965, and on December 10, 1965, the corporation was licensed to do business on Guam.

Seemingly endless delays have prevented the company from getting into production. Months of delay were encountered in the delivery of production machinery and equipment to Guam after orders had been placed. The Department of Labor's new requirements governing the entry into the United States and its possessions for employment purposes of foreign personnel have interminably delayed the arrival on Guam of the foreign-born, skilled watchmakers necessary to supervise the bulk of the work force comprised of native Guamanians. Despite an application filed in the early days of 1966 for a hearing which is a legal prerequisite to the receipt of local tax benefits and other incentives designed to induce industry to locate on Guam, such a hearing has never been held and only recently was notification received that a hearing could be held in the latter part of October 1966.

These are the principal causes of the extended delays which have kept this company from developing any actual production experience so far this year. Although H.R. 8436 as reported by the Senate Finance Committee and the committee's report on the bill specify that allocations to individual producers shall be "fair and equitable" it is likely that this Guam corporation, because of its lack of any actual production experience, will receive no allocation at all—with the result that the more than $25,000 that has been invested in it will go down the drain except for minor salvage.

To those who would argue that the words "fair and equitable" insure against such an inequitable result, it is important to know that highly placed executive branch officials have flatly indicated that a company without production experience will receive a quota of zero or near zero. The amendment would make certain that the equitable intent of the law is realized. The amendment is of general application and could be of benefit to other companies similarly situated whether in the Virgin Islands, American Samoa or possibly also on Guam.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I regret that, as spokesman for the committee, I must oppose the amendment. This amendment would qualify a company that went to Guam and undertook to qualify and obtain a license to produce watches in Guam, at a time when the House had passed a bill that would prohibit any of those watches coming in from Guam. So here was an American speculator, out of New York City, going over to Guam and gambling that the Senate would award a quota to Guam, and that he would get a piece of it.

Mr. President, what we would do in the Senate bill with regard to all watches produced in the Virgin Islands as well as Guam and elsewhere is not to say who shall produce those watches, but that the Secretary of the Interior—as provided on pages 4 and 6—Mr. President, I regret to say that the bill contains a typographical error; it should be pages 4 and 5. I ask unanimous consent that page 6 of the bill be renumbered as page 5.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The bill provides, on those pages, as follows:

The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce, acting jointly, shall allocate on a fair and equitable basis among producers of watches and watch movements located in the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa the quotas for each calendar year.

We do not propose to say who gets what. We merely say look at all the equities and, as far as we are concerned, we let the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Interior set up pretty much the standards they wish to set up, but they must be fair and equitable in doing it. Let them consider this man's case along with everybody else's, and allocate quotas to these people on what seems to be a fair and reasonable basis.

Mr. President, I would not wish to have the responsibility of telling this man how many watches he can or cannot produce. I would not want that responsibility with respect to the Timex Corp., the Waltham Corp., or any other company. That is something that should be administratively determined. It involves a myriad of problems that the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce are administratively qualified to handle.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is nothing in the bill to prevent this man's getting his share or all of the quota that goes to Guam?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No. It is perfectly all right with me if he gets it all. But I do not wish to say so in the law. Let the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Interior look into the man's case, and compare the equities and the fairness of his situation with all the others, and whatever appears to be fair, let them do it. I think that would be a better solution than for us here on the floor of the Senate to try to say which producer gets what quota.

Therefore, while I sympathize with the man's problem, and I realize the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is most interested in the matter, and I wish his man well, I hope the Senate does not get into the business of trying to say who gets the quotas and who does not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I merely wish the RECORD to show that the distinguished Senator from New York is unavoidably absent from the floor of the Senate today; therefore, he asked me to present this amendment in his behalf.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed the question is on the engrossment of the committee amendment, as amended, and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill (H.R. 8436) was read the third time, and passed.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 3 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 10, 13, 24, and 27 to the bill (H.R. 15941) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant 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.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES, TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS, AND TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, during the adjournment of the Senate from the close of business today until 10 a.m. tomorrow, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and from the House of Representatives; the Vice President and the President pro tempore be authorized to sign enrolled bills; and committees to file reports together with individual, supplemental, or minority views, if desired.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS BILL OF 1967

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 17636, the District of Columbia appropriations bill, be called. I do this so that it may become the pending business.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. H.R. 17636, an act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15941) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, the committee of conference agreed on appropriations totaling $58,067,472,000 for the various military programs and activities of the Department of Defense, exclusive of military construction, family housing, civil defense, and military assistance, except that portion of military assistance to nations providing help in the southeast Asia conflict.

The total is $122,400,000 under the amount provided by the Senate and $548,973,000 under the amount provided by the House. It is $403,119,000 over the budget estimates for fiscal year 1967 of $57,664,353,000 and $790,531,000 under the appropriations for fiscal year 1966 of $58,858,003,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point, a tabulation giving the amount of the 1967 budget estimates, the House allowance, the Senate allowance and the conference allowance for each appropriation of the bill.

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

Summary of Department of Defense appropriations for fiscal year 1967

Title	Budget estimates, 1967	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House	Senate
Title I—Military personnel	$18,675,700,000	$19,299,344,000	$18,731,044,000	$18,731,044,000	+$55,344,000	−$568,300,000	
Title II—Operation and maintenance	15,675,094,000	15,722,794,000	15,697,721,000	15,703,321,000	+28,227,000	−19,473,000	+$5,600,000
Title III—Procurement	16,408,200,000	16,658,000,000	16,769,800,000	16,641,800,000	+233,600,000	−16,200,000	−128,000,000
Title IV—Research, development, test, and evaluation	6,905,359,000	6,928,959,000	6,983,959,000	6,983,959,000	+78,600,000	+55,000,000	
Title V—Special foreign currency program	(1)	7,348,000	7,348,000	7,348,000	+7,348,000		
Total, Department of Defense	57,664,353,000	58,616,445,000	58,189,872,000	58,067,472,000	+403,119,000	−548,973,000	−122,400,000
Distribution of appropriations by organizational unit:							
Army	16,925,794,000	17,441,038,000	17,165,065,000	17,165,065,000	+239,271,000	−275,973,000	
Navy	16,813,200,000	16,938,600,000	16,979,700,000	16,826,700,000	+13,500,000	−111,900,000	−153,000,000
Air Force	20,686,300,000	20,965,400,000	20,774,900,000	20,805,900,000	+119,600,000	−159,500,000	+31,000,000
Defense agencies	3,239,059,000	3,271,407,000	3,270,207,000	3,269,807,000	+30,748,000	−1,600,000	−400,000
Total, Department of Defense	57,664,353,000	58,616,445,000	58,189,872,000	58,067,472,000	+403,119,000	−548,973,000	−122,400,000
TITLE I—MILITARY PERSONNEL							
Military personnel, Army	6,164,400,000	6,429,400,000	6,164,400,000	6,164,400,000		−265,000,000	
Military personnel, Navy	3,652,100,000	3,736,100,000	3,652,100,000	3,652,100,000		−84,000,000	
Military personnel, Marine Corps	1,183,200,000	1,214,200,000	1,183,200,000	1,183,200,000		−31,000,000	
Military personnel, Air Force	5,015,800,000	5,204,800,000	5,015,800,000	5,015,800,000		−189,000,000	
Reserve personnel, Army		288,211,000	288,211,000	288,211,000	+288,211,000		
Reserve personnel, Navy	111,900,000	111,900,000	112,600,000	112,600,000	+700,000	+700,000	
Reserve personnel, Marine Corps	36,500,000	36,500,000	36,500,000	36,500,000			
Reserve personnel, Air Force	69,700,000	69,700,000	69,700,000	69,700,000			

See footnote at end of table.

Summary of Department of Defense appropriations for fiscal year 1967—Continued

Title	Budget estimates, 1967	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House	Senate
TITLE I—MILITARY PERSONNEL—con.							
National Guard and Reserve personnel, Army	$581,300,000				−$581,300,000		
National Guard personnel, Army		$346,533,000	$346,533,000	$346,533,000	+346,533,000		
National Guard personnel, Air Force	80,800,000	82,000,000	82,000,000	82,000,000	+1,200,000		
Retired pay, Defense	1,780,000,000	1,780,000,000	1,780,000,000	1,780,000,000			
Total, title I—Military personnel	18,675,700,000	19,299,344,000	18,731,044,000	18,731,044,000	+55,344,000	−$568,300,000	
TITLE II—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE							
Operation and maintenance, Army	5,009,000,000	5,132,200,000	5,122,427,000	5,122,427,000	+113,427,000	−9,773,000	
Operation and maintenance, Navy	3,982,900,000	3,982,900,000	3,980,300,000	3,980,300,000	−2,600,000	−2,600,000	
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps	325,600,000	325,600,000	325,600,000	325,600,000			
Operation and maintenance, Air Force	4,942,600,000	4,948,600,000	4,937,100,000	4,943,100,000	+500,000	−5,500,000	+$6,000,000
Operation and maintenance, Defense Agencies	808,100,000	808,100,000	806,900,000	806,500,000	−1,600,000	−1,600,000	−400,000
Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard and Reserve	340,600,000				−340,600,000		
Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard		231,000,000	231,000,000	231,000,000	+231,000,000		
Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard	250,200,000	253,300,000	253,300,000	253,300,000	+3,100,000		
National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army	494,000	494,000	494,000	494,000			
Claims, Defense	[2] (25,000,000)	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	+25,000,000		
Contingencies, Defense	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000			
Court of Military Appeals, Defense	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000			
Total, title II—Operation and maintenance	15,675,094,000	15,722,794,000	15,697,721,000	15,703,321,000	+28,227,000	−19,473,000	+5,600,000
TITLE III—PROCUREMENT							
Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army	3,311,100,000	3,484,500,000	3,483,300,000	3,483,300,000	+172,200,000	−1,200,000	
Procurement of aircraft and missiles, Navy	1,789,900,000	1,789,900,000	1,789,900,000	1,789,900,000			
Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy	1,751,300,000	1,756,700,000	1,909,700,000	1,756,700,000	+5,400,000		−153,000,000
Other procurement, Navy	1,968,300,000	1,968,300,000	1,968,300,000	1,968,300,000			
Procurement, Marine Corps	262,900,000	262,900,000	262,900,000	262,900,000			
Aircraft procurement, Air Force	3,961,300,000	4,032,300,000	3,992,300,000	4,017,300,000	+56,000,000	−15,000,000	+25,000,000
Missile procurement, Air Force	1,189,500,000	1,189,500,000	1,189,500,000	1,189,500,000			
Other procurement, Air Force	2,122,600,000	2,122,600,000	2,122,600,000	2,122,600,000			
Procurement, Defense agencies	51,300,000	51,300,000	51,300,000	51,300,000			
Total, title III—Procurement	16,408,200,000	16,658,000,000	16,769,800,000	16,641,800,000	+233,600,000	−16,200,000	−128,000,000
TITLE IV—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION							
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army	1,518,900,000	1,528,700,000	1,528,700,000	1,528,700,000	+9,800,000		
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy	1,748,600,000	1,753,600,000	1,758,600,000	1,758,600,000	+10,000,000	+5,000,000	
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force	3,053,800,000	3,062,600,000	3,112,600,000	3,112,600,000	+58,800,000	+50,000,000	
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense agencies	459,059,000	459,059,000	459,059,000	459,059,000			
Emergency fund, Defense	[3] 125,000,000	[3] 125,000,000	[3] 125,000,000	[3] 125,000,000			
Total, title IV—Research, development, test, and evaluation	6,905,359,000	6,928,959,000	6,983,959,000	6,983,959,000	+78,600,000	+55,000,000	
TITLE V—SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM							
Special foreign currency program	[4]	7,348,000	7,348,000	7,348,000	+7,348,000		
Total, general appropriations	57,664,353,000	58,616,445,000	58,189,872,000	58,067,472,000	+403,119,000	−548,973,000	−122,400,000

[1] Amount of original budget estimate was $11,965,000 in the form of local currency amounts. The request was reduced subsequently by the Department of Defense to $7,348,000.

[2] Annual, indefinite account not included in total.

[3] In addition, $150,000,000 to be derived by transfer.

[4] Estimates were submitted in local currency amounts which were equivalent to $11,965,000. The original amounts were subsequently reduced to $7,348,000 at the request of the Department of Defense.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, the most significant change in the bill is the disallowance of $153 million included in the Senate bill for the construction of two guided-missile destroyers. It was the position of the Senate that the Navy has a requirement for both—the nuclear-powered guided-missile frigate and the two guided-missile destroyers. The Senate conferees did all that could be done to maintain this position, but the House conferees would not yield. I regret that the Senate had to recede on this matter.

Mr. President, I do not propose to take the time of the Senate to describe the conference action on all of the 33 amendments which the conference committee considered. I shall be available for any questions at the conclusion of my remarks. However, I do wish to describe certain actions on differences between the two Houses which have been the subject of particular interest.

It will be recalled that the Senate adopted an amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts and myself giving the President the authority to order to active duty members of the Ready Reserves of the Armed Forces who had not served on active duty of other than training. The conference committee agreed on a new provision that authorizes the President to call to active duty for 24 months less previous active duty and active duty for training—

First. Members of the Ready Reserve not in paid-drill units of the Reserve forces who have not completed their statutory obligation or have not served on active duty or active duty for training for a period of 24 months.

Second. Members of units of the Ready Reserve who have not had the 4 months' training required for members enlisting in the Army's Reserve components.

Third. Units of the Ready Reserve.

Some confusion has arisen as to the meaning of the term "selected Reserve" as used in the provision agreed to by the conference committee. As used in this provision, the term "selected Reserve" includes all the paid-drill units of the Reserve forces. The term should not be confused with the Army's select Reserve force of 150,000 men.

It will be seen, Mr. President, that under the provisions of the conference agreement, the President not only can call up the individuals in the various categories enumerated, but he can also call up any organized unit of the Reserve Forces of any of the branches of the Armed Services, without the necessity of declaring a national emergency.

Mr. President, this provision, if utilized, will go a long way to correct many of the inequities that now exist between service by individuals drafted under the Selective Service System and those individuals enlisting in the various Reserve components. It is my hope that the President will see fit to use this authority.

Another item of interest is the Senate amendment placing a per pupil limitation of $455 on the total funds available for the operation of the overseas dependents' school system. The

conference committee agreed on a limitation of $490 with a provision that in establishing the rates of compensation of teachers in the system, the Secretary of Defense could not go below the rates in effect on June 30, 1966. However, I want to make it clear that the sum of $490 is based on these teachers receiving those rates of compensation established under the formula in Public Law 89–391. It will be recalled that the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] and the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] offered an amendment during consideration of the bill to provide for a limitation of $492. The purpose of their amendment was to provide for the higher salaries provided for in Public Law 89–391. The $490 limitation will accomplish this purpose.

Generally speaking, I believe that the action taken by the conferees is in conformity with the expressions of opinion voiced earlier on the floor of the Senate. Certainly the appropriation as it stands will strengthen the national security during the present fiscal year.

The final agreement has been reached after long and tedious negotiations in our parliamentary process; and I believe that we have arrived at a good bill, and one that will be adequate for the present at least.

I will be glad, Mr. President, to undertake to answer any questions Members might have on the conference report.

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

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who is the ranking minority member of the conference committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I join with the chairman of the committee and hope that the Senate will accept this conference report. While it does not do everything that the Senate wanted, it does substantially what we want; and I believe that it fulfills the needs of our Armed Forces, certainly until Congress returns in January.

We all know and realize that the war in Vietnam is costing us a very substantial amount of money every month, and while there will be enough money in this budget to carry through until Congress comes back, there will be a deficit which must be taken care of at a later time.

Mr. President, both the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the committee, and I believe that the provision that we had in the bill that was passed by the Senate after considerable discussion regarding the use of the Reserves was a helpful one. But the House rejected that provision, and we had a second conference yesterday, which the Senator has described, and adopted the language that was in the House bill, that came out of the Committee on Armed Services, on this subject.

We did not adopt all of that bill, because it is before the Committee on Armed Services. We did adopt the language, with a few modifications, that was in the bill concerning the use of selected Reserves.

As the Senator pointed out, the term "selected Reserves" includes all of the paid-drill units and Reserve forces which are composed of select, immediate, and reinforcement Reserves.

The Senator's amendment, and mine, as originally offered in the Senate would make it possible for the President to call up individuals in the paid Reserve which consists of approximately 600,000 men. The conference report will make it possible to draw approximately 59,000 from the so-called selected Reserves who have had training but are not assigned to any units, and approximately 135,000 men from the immediate Reserves, which consists of men who have had no training at all, but who are parts of units. That total is now 189,000.

I personally believe this is fair. I believe I would have been willing to support the Senate amendment in full, but the conference decided on this number, which is approximately 189,000.

This was the great issue in the conference, and it was decided to compromise this way, which I believe is fair under all of the circumstances. The money is there and the language is there. I join with the chairman of the committee in hoping that the Senate may adopt the conference report in full.

I thank the chairman for giving me the opportunity to express these thoughts.

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

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have received an interesting letter from a Montana woman, which I should like to read. Then I should like to have the chairman's comments. I shall not give any names. The letter reads as follows:

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I teach American history and contemporary problems. My contemporary-problems class is composed of seniors who are necessarily very concerned over the Vietnam war. As you know, Vice President HUMPHREY was in Montana last week and made the statement to the effect that he did not believe it would be necessary to call out the Reserves. My class was discussing this because it was just one more statement to that effect. What they want to know and what I want to know is this:

1. Why should the Reserves not be called out before the kids sitting across the desk from me are drafted? What is holy about the Reserves? They are paid each month, and if they cannot be called, why do we have them and why do we pay them? Let's use them or dismiss them.

2. Why not dissolve our precious Reserves, and take the money used to pay them to increase the pay we give to those who are dodging (and sometimes unsuccessfully) bullets in Vietnam?

3. Why should anyone who never gets closer to a major conflict than Reserve centers "retire" from the Reserves on a pension? Again, let's give the pension, in larger amounts, to those who fight. And finally:

4. If we are to be in continuous conflict for years, why should the burden of defense of this country devolve upon those youngsters whose parents are not financially capable of sending them to college, or who do not have the ability to do well? We think the present draft laws are placing the moneyed and the intellectually capable in the position of aristocracy—the favored and the exempt. Why do we not enact a universal manhood training law, giving all boys a year of military training after graduation from high school, even flat-footed ones? I know some of my very intellectual students who could profit by taking orders fully as much as some of the less gifted, less affluent ones.

If the draft were fair at all, if those who are in the Reserves were subjected to military service as well as the ones who cannot now get into the Reserves, part of the resentment would disappear. I think it is about time the young kids were told why they must fight before they have a future, while the Reserves go happily on their way, inconvenienced by an hour or so of training occasionally.

Very truly yours,

_____.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I may say to the distinguished majority leader that his correspondent has stated more cogently than I could have many of the arguments I presented on the floor when I urged the adoption of the Russell-Saltonstall amendment in the first instance.

I do not think, however, that the reservists themselves are altogether culpable. I think most of them are ready to go and fight. I think they realize they have been paid as reservists. To use an old expression from Elizabethan days: They have taken the king's shilling, and they are obligated to wear the uniform when the king calls.

The difficulty has been in persuading the other body to agree to provisions that would truly enforce equality of service as between all of the young men in these United States. I do not know if the distinguished Senator recalls it or not, but when this amendment was pending in the first instance I stated then that I had always advocated a system of universal military training, and that I considered the greatest victory of my legislative career the fact that I had been able to secure passage by the Senate of a bill that established a system of universal military training. That bill languished and died in the other body.

I can only say, Mr. President, that the writer of that letter, who is teaching in the high schools of Montana—and they certainly have a wonderful system of education in that State—should be the dean of a larger and higher institution of learning in that State.

Better than that, I would that she had been a Member of the other body when this amendment was presented on the floor, for she could have made that persuasive argument there. It might have touched some of those who were otherwise so enamored of the pressure groups who purport to speak for the Reserve organizations and who are among some of the most formidable lobbies—and I do not use that term in an offensive sense—in Washington.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would simply say to the distinguished majority leader, for whom we have great regard, that he take from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the speeches of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and, most modestly, my own, and send them in an envelope to that lady because she expresses much better and more succinctly than we did the arguments we tried to express on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. She will get them.

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

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from

Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], who is ex officio a member of the committee of conference, representing the standing Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator. I first congratulate him on the conference report and the success he has had in establishing some of the ideas that have been presented so well in the letter just read by the majority leader.

Only this afternoon it was my privilege to talk with a group of high school students. Over one-half of the questions from these students, girls as well as boys, had to do with what they considered were the injustices incident to the current taking of youth into the armed services.

I associate myself with remarks of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], in that this letter expresses well many of the apprehensions that we have had for some months incident to the drafting of American youth.

However, I would ask this question of the Senator from Georgia: Is it not true, under the conference report now being presented to the Senate, that some of the inequities in this current situation have been corrected? Is that not a fair statement?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Yes, it has been partially corrected as to individuals. Under the language of the conference agreement, the President could call up as individuals 208,000 of the reservists out of a total number of 660,000 which we sought to cover in the original amendment.

In addition, the President is authorized to call up any organized units without the necessity of declaring a national emergency.

Mr. SYMINGTON. And that has been accepted by the House?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That has already been approved today by an overwhelming vote in the House of Representatives.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, again, with respect, I commend the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] who fought long and hard in conferences to see that equity and justice were given to all American youths under present law.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. We have taken a step in the direction of equality of service, Mr. President, but we will never be able to achieve that end without some system of universal military training. Under the conditions which exist today, and the laws that we have, which place this great discretion in the local boards which are appointed by the Governors of the several States, it is impossible to avoid some inequities, but we are moving as vigorously as we can to head this body in that direction.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the conferees on the Department of Defense appropriation are to be congratulated for arriving at a realistic per pupil limitation of $490 for the overseas dependent school system. This figure will permit salaries to be paid to teachers as provided by the amendment to the Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act enacted on April 14 of this year. It will also make it possible to improve the instructional services and supplies for the children in these schools.

I am confident that the overseas teachers will demonstrate their appreciation of this appropriation by increased dedication to the job at hand—that of providing the children of U.S. servicemen stationed overseas with an instructional program in keeping with the national ideal of quality education. While I still believe it preferable that no per pupil limitation be written into the law, I feel sure that those responsible for administering the DOD overseas schools can operate effectively and efficiently under the limitation here provided in such a way that the Congress will in the future accept the recommendation for no per pupil limitation.

On behalf of the overseas teachers and of those Members of the Senate who supported my efforts earlier this session to strike the per pupil limitation from the Defense appropriations bill, I want to thank the able conferees of the Senate for their understanding and their statesmanship in achieving for the time being the settlement of this issue, so that the education of the military dependent children may be improved.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 15941, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to the bill (H.R. 15941) entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes", and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert: *"Provided further,* That—

"(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, until June 30, 1968, the President may order to active duty any member of the Ready Reserve of an armed force who—

"(1) is not assigned to, or participating satisfactorily in, a unit in the Selected Reserve, and

"(2) has not fulfilled his statutory reserve obligation, and

"(3) has not served on active duty or active duty for training for a total of twenty-four months.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, until June 30, 1968, the President may order to active duty any member of the Ready Reserve of an armed force who had become a member of a reserve component prior to July 1, 1966; and who

"(1) has not served on active duty or active duty for training for a period of one hundred and twenty days or more, and

"(2) has not fulfilled his statutory reserve military obligation.

"(c) A member ordered to active duty under this section may be required to serve on active duty until his total service on active duty or active duty for training equals twenty-four months. If the enlistment or period of military service of a member of the Ready Reserves ordered to active duty under subsections (a) or (b) of this section would expire before he has served the required period of active duty prescribed herein, his enlistment or period of military service may be extended until that service on active duty has been completed.

"(d) In order to achieve fair treatment as between members in the Ready Reserve who are being considered for active duty under this section, appropriate consideration shall be given to—

"(1) family responsibilities; and

"(2) employment necessary to maintain the national health, safety, or interest.

"(e) notwithstanding any other provision of law, until June 30, 1968, the President may, when he deems it necessary, order to active duty any unit of the Ready Reserve of an armed force for a period of not to exceed twenty-four months."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$806,500,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: at the end thereof, add the following: ", but this proviso shall not apply to advance procurement of equipment the total cost of which shall not exceed $7,800,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "490", and at the end thereof strike out the semicolon and insert the following: ", but in no event at less than the rates of compensation in effect on June 30, 1966";

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Delete the following words "Committees on Appropriations of the".

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 5, 10, 13, 24, and 27.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, that concludes legislative action on the Defense appropriation bill for 1967.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and also the ranking minority Member, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], for their remarks in response to the letter from the Montana lady who teaches in a high school and who, I am sure, will find our remarks interesting and worth a good deal of discussion in her class.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The issue we have discussed is one which should be discussed all over the United States, because it deals with a very vital question in our form of government; namely, the equal responsibility of every person similarly situated to defend the Nation in time of national peril, or war.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, the Senate will convene at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, as has already been agreed to, in order to take up the District of Columbia appropriations bill, and also the

conference report on the public works appropriation bill, which will be available early in the morning.

Following action on those two pieces of legislation, it is the intention of the joint leadership to lay down the foreign investors tax bill, to be followed—not necessarily in this order—by such items as international education; the allied health bill; the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill—the last one outstanding except for the supplemental appropriation; and then the investment tax credit bill and other items which will have been reported today by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and other committees.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant 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.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AT 10 O'CLOCK A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 12, 1966, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 11, 1966:

THE JUDICIARY

Bryan Simpson, of Florida, to be U.S. Circuit judge, Fifth Circuit, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

Charles R. Scott, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge for the middle district of Florida to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

Fred J. Cassibry, of Louisiana, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

Donald Stuart Russell, of South Carolina, to be U.S. district judge for the district of South Carolina vice Charles C. Wyche, deceased.

Robert D. Smith, Jr., of Arkansas, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Arkansas for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Charles M. Conway, of Arkansas, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Arkansas for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Edward A. Heslep, of California, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of California for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Russell Arnold, Smiths, Ala., in place of F. B. Malloy, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Doris A. Esteban, Idria, Calif., in place of M. A. Barnard, retired.

Richard M. Mollin, Murphys, Calif., in place of E. M. Mitchler, retired.

INDIANA

Wendell J. Van Riper, Noblesville, Ind., in place of Arthur Heiny, retired.

KANSAS

Morris D. Crouse, Albert, Kans., in place of W. F. Folkerts, retired.

KENTUCKY

Robert G. Hill, Florence, Ky., in place of R. C. Lutes, retired.

Wendel R. Bridges, Morning View, Ky., in place of Elmer Schadler, retired.

LOUISIANA

Kirby Allen, Clarks, La., in place of L. L. Jackson, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Rosemarie L. Dolan, Greenbush, Mass., in place of C. M. Waite, retired.

Edward L. Perry, North Truro, Mass., in place of F. W. Garran, resigned.

Richard E. Briggs, South Lee, Mass., in place of N. D. Potter, resigned.

OHIO

Joseph L. Clark, Amlin, Ohio, in place of R. M. Patch, retired.

TEXAS

George B. Yeager, Jr., Bay City, Tex., in place of S. G. Selkirk, Jr., retired.

VIRGINIA

John H. Wayman, Kilmarnock, Va., in place of R. G. Claybrook, retired.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named officers to be permanent commissioned officers of the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

Dwight W. Shores	Norman J. Cross
Cyrus E. Potts	James L. Mapel
Frederick W. Cressman	Gerald D. Mills
	Lyman B. Norton
Billy D. Lovern	Lynn M. Brown
John E. Streeper	Phillip J. Kies
Charles J. Miotke	Monette B. J. Ratcliff
Billy G. Cunningham	Virgil J. O'Grady
Alfred T. Miles	Erwin F. Chase, Jr.
Harold T. Sherman	Dale W. Johnson
Heloma L. Goforth	Charles L. Gomez
Gary R. Hall	Jacob P. Aucoin, Sr.
David Corson	Howard H. Lindsay
Edward G. O'Keefe	Thomas E. Brown
Robert Q. Shanks	
James R. Walsh	

The following-named officers to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant:

Frank H. Carman	Mikel A. Cole
Harold J. Gellert	Norbert F. Toczko

The following officers of the Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of lieutenant:

Dwight W. Shores	Thomas P. McGann
Ronald C. Zinzer	Gerald F. Woolever
John K. Andrews	David R. Zwick
Stewart B. Morgan	Nelson H. Keeler, Jr.
Cyrus E. Potts	James L. Webster
Frederick W. Cressman	Harry T. Suzuki
	Kevin T. Clancy
Billy D. Lovern	Robert A. Major
John E. Streeper	C. Richard Mockler
Charles J. Miotke	Warren D. Snider
Billy G. Cunningham	Robert L. Vence, Jr.
Alfred T. Miles	Gill R. Goodman
Harold T. Sherman	Howard B. Gehring
Heloma L. Goforth	Richard L. De Vries
Gary R. Hall	Thomas D. Fisher
David Corson	James W. Fry, Jr.
Edward G. O'Keefe	Nelson W. Koscheski, Jr.
Robert Q. Shanks	
James R. Walsh	George J. Buffleben, Jr.
Carl D. Bossard	Robert P. Dickenson
Richard S. Bizar	Billy W. Richardson
Roger W. Bing	Robert E. Leggett
Joseph B. Coyle	David J. Connolly
George J. Thompson	Robert L. Kuhnle
Virgil F. Keith, Jr.	James A. Murray, Jr.
Harry D. Nelson	Denis J. Bluett
Karl L. Reichelt	Edward E. DeMuzzio
Richard A. Walsh	John D. Adams
William B. Waff	Jan F. Smith
John E. Lindak	Michael Burdian
Robert W. Burchell	Michael P. Studley
Arthur E. Katz	Michael E. Greene
Harvey F. Orr	Charles E. Haas
John R. Yetke, Jr.	Stephen J. Ratey, Jr.
Andrew F. Durkee, Jr.	James D. Boyce
Wayne K. Hodsden	Dana W. Starkweather
Stephen T. Ulmer	Roger W. Hassard
David A. Young	David L. Andrews
James J. Lantry	James F. McCahill, Jr.
Dan A. Nauman	Barham F. Thomson III
Kent M. Ballantyne	
Philip R. North	Murray J. Towle
Raymond H. Canada, Jr.	Nicholas H. Allen
	Richard J. Heym
Charles B. Mosher	Anthony R. Adams
George H. Brown III	William A. Monson
John W. Greason	Roger L. Beving
Dennis J. Brady	James C. Haldeman
Kurt L. Elste	Karl W. Mirmak
Ray A. Heller	Forrest F. Furaus, Jr.
Robert G. Bates	Norman J. Cross
Rudy K. Peschel	James L. Mapel
James F. Dewey	Gerald D. Mills
Robert E. Fenton	Lyman B. Norton
Michael J. Jacobs	Lynn M. Brown
William M. Baxley	Phillip J. Kies
Jerome P. Mullins	Monette B. J. Ratcliff
William A Caster	Virgil J. O'Grady
Arthur B. Shepard	Erwin F. Chase, Jr.
Peter C. Busick	Dale W. Johnson
Ronald O. MacFee	Charles L. Gomez
William D. Bechtel	Jacob P. Aucoin, Sr.
David T. Machamer	Howard H. Lindsay
Daniel K. Shorey	Thomas E. Brown
Jeffery D. Hartman	John P. DeLeonardis, Jr.
Ernst M. Cummings	

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 and 3299:

To be majors

Abbott, Walter H., xxxxxx.
Absher, Richard L., xxxxxx.
Ackerman, Arthur H., xxxxxx.
Ackerman, David G., xxxxxx.
Adams, David G., xxxxxx.
Adams, James E., xxxxxx.
Adamson, George W., xxxxxx.
Ades, Leroy P., xxxxxx.
Agather, Frederic G., xxxxxx.
Aikman, Jim B., xxxxxx.
Albert, George R., xxxxxx.
Alch, Wayne F., xxxxxx.
Aldrich, Herbert C., xxxxxx.
Alexander, John V., xxxxxx.
Alexander, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Allan, James R., xxxxxx.
Allebach, Victor L., xxxxxx.
Allen, Leverne E., xxxxxx.
Alter, Allen G., xxxxxx.
Ambrose, Thomas J., xxxxxx.
Ames, William I., Jr., xxxxxx.
Anderson, Benjamin, xxxxxx.
Anderson, James C., xxxxxx.
Anderson, Paul F., xxxxxx.
Anderson, Thomas L., xxxxxx.
Anderson, Thurman E., xxxxxx.
Andrews, Wilson P., xxxxxx.
Angel, Jack F., xxxxxx.
Angstadt, John P., xxxxxx.
Apuna, Samuel K., Jr., xxxxxx.
Arduna, Arthur A., xxxxxx.
Arnaud, John F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Arnhym, Rolfe G., xxxxxx.
Artzberger, Ronald, xxxxxx.
Asbelle, Charles T., xxxxxx.
Ash, Philip L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Atwood, Thomas W. W., xxxxxx.
Auer, Charles H., xxxxx.
Austin, Kenneth S., xxxxxx.
Ayers, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Bacey, Algirdas S., xxxxxx.
Bailey, David G., xxxxxx.

Bailey, Richard R., xxxxxx.
Bailey, Rusian B., xxxxxx.
Baird, Niven J., xxxxxx.
Baker, John F., xxxxxx.
Baker, Russell A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Bal, Roscius Irving, xxxxxx.
Ball, Charles F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Ball, Duard D., xxxxxx.
Bambery, James R., xxxxxx.
Bamford, Charles F., xxxxxx.
Banks, Douglas T., xxxxxx.
Bardwell, Lloyd R., xxxxxx.
Barker, James M., xxxxxx.
Barrett, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Bartlett, Fred O., Jr., xxxxxx.
Barton, Jack L., xxxxxx.
Barton, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Basic, Nick J., xxxxxx.
Bastian, Richard K., xxxxxx.
Bauerband, Edward H., xxxxxx.
Baughman, Larry J., xxxxx.
Bauman, William F., xxxxxx.
Baynard, Richard A., xxxxxx.
Beall, George F., xxxxxx.
Beams, Clare F., III, xxxxxxxx.
Bean, Calvin R., xxxxxx.
Beardsley, William, xxxxxx.
Beasley, Linton C., xxxxxx.
Beatty, Robert D., xxxxxx.
Becker, Hans V., Jr., xxxxxx.
Beckwith, Charlie A., xxxxxx.
Bell, Robert S., xxxxxx.
Bell, Wiley W., xxxxxx.
Bell, William R., xxxxxx.
Bellis, William H., xxxxxx.
Benedit, Edward B., xxxxxxxx.
Bente, James A., xxxxxx.
Bentley, Ernest E., xxxxxx.
Berzinec, William E., xxxxxx.
Beshens, Gerald J., xxxxxx.
Bickmore, Jesse O., xxxxxx.
Biggerstaff, Allan, xxxxxx.
Billington, Norton, xxxxxxxx.
Birmingham, David F., xxxxxx.
Bishop, Edward L. P., xxxxxx.
Black, William T., xxxxxx.
Blackledge, David W., xxxxxx.
Blaker, John R., xxxxxx.
Blalock, Charlie L., xxxxxx.
Blanco, Silviano J., xxxxxxxx.
Blanton, Clay E., xxxxxx.
Blastos, Constantine J., xxxxxx.
Blauvelt, Richard B., xxxxxx.
Bleecker, James F., xxxxxx.
Blottie, Donald L., xxxxxx.
Blum, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Bohlin, Harry J., xxxx
Boman, Jack D., xxxxxx.
Bomberger, Richard, xxxxxx.
Bookman, Edmund B., xxxxxx.
Boone, Louis C. Jr., xxxxxx.
Booz, Donald V., II, xxxxxx.
Boring, Landin F., xxxxxx.
Born, Keith L., xxxxxx.
Boucher, Leo P. Jr., xxxxxx.
Bourgeois, Randolph, xxxxx
Bourne, Harold O., xxxxxx.
Bowen, James E., III, xxxxxx.
Bowers, James M., xxxxxx.
Boxell, Robert A., xxxxxx.
Boydston, Arland D., xxxxxxxx.
Boykin, Curtis R., xxxxxx.
Boyle, Richard D., xxxxxx.
Brain, Tom H., xxxxxx.
Brake, John W., xxxxxx.
Brannon, William W., xxxxxx.
Brayton, Neal C., xxxxxxxx.
Breckenridge, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Brewer, Curtis A., xxxxxx.
Brewington, Charlie, xxxxxx.
Brewster, Lawrence, xxxxxx.
Bricker, James W., xxxxxx.
Bridgman, Earl N., Jr., xxxxxx.
Briggs, Philip D., xxxxxx.
Brinson, William B., xxxxxx.
Britten, Gerald H., xxxxxx.
Broadbent, Carl D., xxxxxx.
Brons, Russell L., xxxxxx.
Brooker, Clarence B., xxxxxx.
Brophy, Jeremiah J., xxxxxx.
Brosious, George D., xxxxxx.
Brown, Arthur E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Brown, Bury G., Jr., xxxxxx.
Brown, Donald S., xxxxxx.
Brown, Henry L., xxxxxx.
Brown, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Bruen, John D., xxxxxx.
Brumley, William B., xxxxxx.
Bruns, Bernard W., xxxxxx.
Bryan, Edward P., xxxxxx.
Bryant, DeeWitt T., xxxxxx.
Bryant, Joel W., xxxxxx.
Buchanan, Elton E., xxxxxx.
Buck, Horatio S., Jr., xxxxxx.
Buck, Kent L., xxxxxx.
Bukoski, James R., xxxxxx.
Burdeau, Edward K., xxxxxx.
Burdeshaw, William, xxxxxx.
Burke, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Burkhardt, William, xxxxxx.
Burns, Billie R., xxxxxxxx.
Burns, Sumner C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Busck, Albert A., xxxxxx.
Butler, Don A., xxxx
Butler, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Butterworth, James, xxxxxx.
Buzzell, Kenneth E., xxxxxx.
Byrne, Thomas D., xxxx
Byrnes, Vincent F., xxxxxx.
Cahill, Philip J., xxxxxx.
Cain, James W., xxxxxx.
Callahan, Bernard L., xxxxxx.
Campbell, James G., xxxxxx.
Campbell, William E., xxxxxx.
Camper, William C., xxxxxx.
Canedy, Charles E., xxxxxx.
Cannon, Glen B., xxxxxx.
Cannon, Lee B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Cannon, Sammy J., xxxxxx.
Canonico, John N., xxxxxx.
Cantrell, Waniford, xxxxxx.
Carlson, Dale L., xxxxxx.
Carson, Howard E., xxxxxx.
Carter, John B., xxxxxx.
Carter, Robert A., xxxxxx.
Caruso, John P., xxxxxx.
Casey, John P., Jr., xxxxxx.
Cassella, Arthur C., xxxxxx.
Cassidy, John J., xxxxxx.
Cates, Arthur J., xxxxxx.
Cauthen, John R., xxxxxx.
Ceglowski, John P., xxxxxx.
Chabot, Don W., xxxxxx.
Chaffin, Jimmie M., xxxxxx.
Chafin, Leonard D., xxxxxx.
Chamberlain, George, xxxxxx.
Chamberlain, William C., xxxxxx.
Chandler, Victor E., xxxxxx.
Chezem, Jimmie A., xxxxxx.
Childress, Gerald, xxxxxx.
Ching, Harry L. F., xxxxxx.
Chomko, Gene N., xxxxxx.
Christman, Daniel P., xxxxxx.
Churchill, Jack B., xxxxxx.
Churchill, Johnny J., xxxxxx.
Cioffi, William G., xxxxxx.
Cipriani, Lawrence, xxxxxx.
Clapp, Max A., xxxxxx.
Clardy, Lawrence L., xxxxxx.
Clark, Allison P., xxxxxx.
Clark, Warren L., xxxxxx.
Clingempeel, William D., xxxxxx.
Coffey, Vernon C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Coggins, Donald W., xxxxxx.
Cole, Fred V., xxxxxx.
Cole, William A., xxxxxx.
Cole, William L., xxxxxx.
Coleman, Edward R., xxxxxx.
Collins, Ashby F., xxxxxx.
Colonna, Gary S., xxxxxx.
Colson, James B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Colvin, William R., xxxxxx.
Comiskey, Ralph E., xxxxxx.
Compton, James M., xxxxxx.
Conder, Raymond C., xxxxxx.
Connell, Charles R., xxxxxx.
Connolly, Thomas F., xxxxxx.
Connolly, William J., xxxxxx.
Conover, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Conway, Donald J., xxxxxx.
Conzelman, Peter S., xxxxxx.
Cook, Ralph J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Cooper, Hamilton A., xxxxxx.
Cooper, John H., xxxxxx.
Corbett, Cleveland, xxxxxx.
Corey, John D., xxxxxx.
Cormier, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Coroneos, Paul P., xxxxxx.
Coston, Charles D., xxxxxx.
Coughlin, Charles L., xxxxxx.
Coursin, Raymond E., xxxxxx.
Cousland, Walter C., xxxxxx.
Coye, Roger H., xxxxxx.
Cragun, Dwight L., xxxxxx.
Crampton, Theodore, xxxxxx.
Creamer, Edmund J., xxxxxx.
Creighton, Neal, xxxxxx.
Crerar, John H., xxxxxx.
Crim, William T., xxxxxx.
Crocker, Merle M., xxxxxx.
Crosby, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Crosland, William E., xxxxxxxx.
Cross, George M., xxxxxx.
Cross, John S., xxxxxx.
Crowell, William B., xxxxxx.
Croyle, Donald W., xxxx
Cunningham, Alfred, xxxxxx.
Currey, Charles E., xxxxxx.
Curry, Paul R., xxxx
Curtiss, Lester R., xxxxxx.
Daggit, Edward A., xxxxxx.
Dalone, Arthur A., xxxxxx.
Daly, Robert F., xxxxxx.
Damon, James A., xxxxxx.
Dannemiller, Leo M., xxxxxx.
Dare, James T., xxxxxx.
Darivoff, Irvin, xxxxxx.
Darling, John E., xxxxxx.
Davies, Joseph F., xxxxxx.
Davis, Donald F., xxxxxx.
Davis, Edwin G., xxxxxx.
Davis, Lauren S., xxxxxx.
Davis, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Davis, Robley W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Davis, Warren C., xxxxxx.
Davis, Willys E., xxxxxx.
Davisson, Henry L., xxxxxx.
Dawson, George R., xxxxxx.
Dawson, Wallace H., xxxxxx.
De Lorenzo, William, xxxxxx.
De Luca, Anthony P., xxxxxx.
De Muynck, Jack E., xxxxxx.
Dearborn, Charles S., xxxxxx.
Del Santo, Michael, xxxxxx.
Delahanty, Raymond, xxxxxx.
Delbridge, Norman G., xxxxxx.
Desaulniers, John J., xxxxxx.
Descoteau, Rudolph, xxxxxx.
Devins, Joseph H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Di Lorenzo, David L., xxxxxx.
Di Simone, Frank B., xxxxxx.
Dick Harvey M., xxxxxx.
Dickson, Lee C., xxxxxx.
Dieterle, John H., xxxxxx.
Digison, Donald K., xxxxxx.
Dillinger, David R., xxxxxx.
Dinges, Edward A., xxxxxx.
Dismore, William E., xxxxxx.
Dixon, John B., xxxxxx.
Dobson, Dale E., xxxxxx.
Dodds, Jack A., xxxxxx.
Dodge, Griffin N., xxxxxx.
Doerer, Richard C., xxxxxx
Dombrowski, Anthony, xxxxxx.
Donahue, James G., xxxxxx.
Donahue, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Donnal, John A., xxxxxx.
Donnell, Henry K., xxxxxx.
Dooley, Thomas R., xxxxxx.
Doran, Fred R., xxxxxx.
Dorsey, Robert G., xxxxxx.
Dotson, Larry D., xxxxxx.
Dotson, Richard F., xxxxxxxx.
Doty, Benjamin E., xxxxxx.
Doucette, Roger A., xxxxxx.
Dowling, John H., xxxxxx.
Downer, Harry S., Jr. xxxxxx.
Downey, Allan N., xxxxxx.
Doyle, David K., xxxxxx.
Doyon, Leonard E., xxxxxx.
Drenz, Charles F., xxxxxx.
Duffy, James P., xxxxxx.
Duffy, William D., xxxxxx.

Duffy, William J., xxxxxx.
Dukkony, Stephen J., xxxxxx.
Dunham, Gerald L., xxxxxx.
Dunlap, Robert R., xxxxxx.
Dunn, Charles H., xxxxxx.
Durany, John A., xxxxxx.
Dyment, Leroy W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Eachus, David A., xxxxxx.
Earle, Thomas B., Jr. xxxxxx.
Early, Felix L., Jr. xxxxxx.
Echols, Herald V., xxxxxx.
Ecrette, Joe D., xxxxxx.
Edwards, David F., xxxxxx.
Edwards, Jerry S., xxxxxx.
Edwards, Williams, xxxxxxxx.
Egbert, George L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Ehlers, O. Kirk, xxxxxx.
Ehlert, Richard A., xxxxxx.
Eineigl, Raymond J., xxxxxx.
Elder, Robert L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Elliott, Harry L., xxxxxx.
Elliott, James W., xxxxxx.
Ellis, Donald D., xxxxxx.
Ellis, Warren H., xxxxxx.
Elmore, Donald J., xxxxxx.
Emery, Calvin B., xxxxxx.
Engle, John F., Jr., xxxxxx.
English, Paul L., xxxxxxx.
Epps, Ferdinand Q., xxxxxx.
Erickson, Alfred H., xxxxxx.
Estep, Glenn R., xxxxxx.
Estes, Billy G., xxxxxx.
Eubanks, James A., xxxxxx.
Evangelos, Christos, xxxxxx.
Evans, James L., xxxxxx.
Evans, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Evrard, James A., xxxxxx.
Eye, Douglas M., xxxxxx.
Eyman, Robert F., xxxxxx.
Fail, Eulan T., xxxxxx.
Falconer, Walter J., xxxxxx.
Fallon, Joel B., xxxxxx.
Farlow, Wilbur M., xxxxxx.
Faught, William F., xxxxxx.
Favre, Rolland M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Fedko, John T., xxxxxx.
Fell, Richard W., xxxxxx.
Felton, Robert G., xxxxxx.
Fenech, Paul M., xxxxxx.
Ferguson, William P., xxxxxx.
Fernandez, Robert N., xxxxxx.
Ferrara, Leonard S., xxxxxx.
Ferris, Gordon F., xxxxxx.
Fewell, Oscar C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Fiala, Charles J., xxxxxx.
Field, Nathaniel A., xxxxxx.
Fields, Charles E., xxxxxx.
Fifer, William A., xxxxxx.
Fike, Edward C., xxxxxx.
Filaseta, Bart M., xxxxxx.
Fincham, Jack E., xxxxxx.
Fischer, Arthur F., xxxxxx.
Fischer, Richard F., xxxxxx.
Fischer, Richard L., xxxxxx.
Fisher, Clyde, Jr., xxxxxx.
Fisher, Samuel H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Fitch, John B., xxxxxx.
Fitzsimmons, Eugene, xxxxxx.
Flaherty, William J., xxxxxx.
Flanagan, John S., xxxxxx.
Fleming, Daniel M., xxxxxx.
Fleming, Harold A., xxxxxxxx.
Fleming, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Flertzheim, Henry A., xxxxxx.
Floyd, Paul E., xxxxxx.
Forbes, Stanley R., xxxxxx.
Ford, Allan T., xxxxxx.
Forrest, Ernest E. J., xxxxxx.
Foster, Edward H., xxxxxx.
Foster, Howard R., xxxxxx.
Foster, Samuel G., xxxxxx.
Fox, Bernard J., xxxxxx.
Fox, John G., xxxxxx.
Fox, Joseph H., xxxxxx.
Fox, Lothar, xxxxxx.
Frank, Edward R., Sr., xxxxxx.
Franklin, James A., xxxxxx.
Franseen, Leonard R., xxxxxx.
Frechette, Joseph P., xxxxxx.
Freeze, James E., xxxxxx.
Freimark, Gaillard, xxxxxx.
French, Rodney M., xxxxxx.
Frenier, Julius A., xxxxxx.
Friedersdorff, Louis C., Jr., xxxxx
Friedman, Arthur M., xxxxxx.
Friesen, Herbert E., xxxxxx.
Frost, Theodore N., xxxxxx.
Fukumoto, George M., xxxxxx.
Fulford, Clarence, J., xxxxxxxx.
Fuller, Elbert E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Fulton, Thomas G., xxxxxx.
Fultz, Forrest G., xxxxxxxx.
Gallagher, Charles, xxxxxx.
Gallant, George W., xxxxxx.
Galloway, Jesse M., xxxxxx.
Gan, Maurice K., xxxxxx.
Gannon, Timothy G., xxxxxx.
Garcia, Efraim S., xxxxxx.
Garcia, Roberto V., xxxxxx.
Garman, Frederick E., xxxxxx.
Garrett, Harold L., xxxxxx.
Garrett, Samuel J., xxxxxx.
Gaumond, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Gausvik, Donald E., xxxxxx.
Gearin, Cornelius J., xxxxxx.
Geiger, Ervine H., Jr., xxxxxx.
George, Manuel J., xxxxxx.
George, Raymond L., xxxxxx.
Gerhards, Peter P., xxxxxx.
Germond, George F., xxxxxx.
Germuga, Gerald A., xxxxxx.
Gibbons, William C., xxxxxx.
Gibbs, Robert M., xxxxxx.
Gill, Oather J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Gillespie, John W., xxxxxx.
Gilliam, Robert, xxxxxx.
Gingrich, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Ginsburg, Howard D., xxxxxx.
Gioiosa, Thomas E., xxxx.
Glasgow, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Glauner, Frederick, xxxxxx.
Goetsch, Elmer A., xxxxxx.
Goetz, Jerald L., xxxxxx.
Gonzales, Orlando E., xxxxxx.
Goodale, George S., xxxxxx.
Goodwin, Willard C., xxxxxxxx.
Gordon, Robert L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Gottsche, John S., xxxxxx.
Graham, Harl G., xxxxxx.
Grant, Samuel J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Gray, Ralph S., xxxxxx.
Gray, Wilmer O., Jr., xxxxxx.
Greeley, Leonard J., xxxxxx.
Greenlaw, Kenneth N., xxxxxx.
Greenleaf, Edward T., xxxxxx.
Greenquist, James C., xxxxxx.
Greynolds, William, xxxxxx.
Griffin, Bobby F., xxxxxx.
Griffin, Guilford W., xxxxxx.
Gruen, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Grum, Allen F., xxxxxx.
Gutschenritter, Earl J., xxxxxx.
Hale, Delmas M., xxxxxx.
Haley, John C., xxxxxx.
Hall, Alvin O., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hall, Henry R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hall, Hugh J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hallock, Richard G., xxxxxx.
Halterman, Harry W., xxxxxx.
Hamby, Dolph F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hamilton, Frank H., xxxxxx.
Hamilton, Robert H., xxxxxxxx.
Hammaker, Charles A., xxxxxxxx.
Hancock, Jack L., xxxxxx.
Hand, Lee M., xxxxxx.
Hanson, Donald F., xxxxxx.
Harbuck, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Harlan, John R., xxxxxx.
Harrick, Stephen R., xxxxxx.
Harris, Bobby J., xxxxxx.
Harris, James H., xxxxxx.
Harris, John R., xxxxxx.
Harris, William H., xxxxxx.
Haskell, Richard B., xxxxxx.
Hastings, C. Frederick, Jr., xxxxxx.
Hausman, Conrad K., xxxxxx.
Hawkins, Billy R., xxxxxx.
Hawlk, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Haxton, Owen V., xxxxxx.
Hayes, Jack O., xxxxxx.
Hayward, Barton M., xxxxxx.
Hazlett, Howard, III, xxxxxx.
Heath, Bobby R., xxxxxx.
Heath, Harry A., xxxxxx.
Heiberg, Elvin R., xxxxxx.
Heitzke, Kenneth S., xxxxxx.
Hembree, Jack E., xxxxxx.
Hendricks, Arthur D., xxxxxx.
Hendricksen, Earl E., xxxxxxxx.
Henry, Frederick S., xxxxxx.
Henschel, William E., xxxxxx.
Henslick, James R., xxxxxx.
Herndon, Phillip H., xxxxxx.
Hertel, Robert G., xxxxxx.
Hetherly, James H., xxxxxx.
Hewell, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Hickerson, Charles, xxxxxx.
Higgins, Wiley T., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hilley, William W., xxxxxx.
Hillman, John K., xxxxxx.
Hilty, James R., xxxxxx.
Hino, Peter J., xxxxxx.
Hobby, Thomas K., xxxxxx.
Hodges, Albert P., xxxxxx.
Hodgson, Lowell F., xxxxxx.
Hoerning, Richard E., xxxxxx.
Hojnacki, William, xxxxxx.
Holcombe, Thomas W., xxxxxx.
Holihen, Joseph M., xxxxxx.
Holley, James P., xxxxxx.
Holmes, Arthur, Jr., xxxxxx
Holtz, Dennis C., xxxxxx.
Honma, Douglas T., xxxxxxxx.
Horner, David D., xxxxxx.
Horton, Richard D., xxxxxx.
Horton, William D., xxxxxx.
Hosford, Jerry N., xxxxxx.
Howard, Jakie M., xxxxxx.
Howard, McErvin, xxxxxx.
Howe, Roderick R., xxxxxx.
Howell, Ernest R., xxxxxx.
Howitz, Ivan H., Jr., xxxxxxx
Hoye, James G., xxxxxx.
Hoyle, Frank E., xxxxxx.
Hudson, Charles F., xxxxxx.
Huebner, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Hughes, Bernard C., xxxxxx.
Hughes, Philip B., xxxxxx.
Hukill, Phillip E., xxxxxx.
Hunt, Jim I., xxxxxx.
Huntington, Raymond, xxxxxx.
Huntley, David L., xxxxxx.
Hurd, Philip S., xxxxxx.
Hurless, Bernard F., xxxxxx.
Husa, Richard F., xxxxxx.
Hutchins, Charles F., xxxxxx.
Hutchinson, Cary B., xxxxxx.
Hutchinson, Harold, xxxxxx.
Hyde, Darwin S., xxxxxx.
Hyde, Richard G., xxxxxx.
Imhoff, Maximilian, xxxxxx.
Ingram, Harvie T., xxxxxx.
Irwin, Thomas G., xxxxxx.
Issacson, Roger M., xxxxxx.
Iverson, Harold E., xxxxxx.
Ivy, James M, IV., xxxxxx.
Jackson, James L., xxxxxx.
Jackson, James M., xxxxxx.
Jackson, John H., xxxxxx.
Jackson, William B., xxxxxx.
Jacobs, Norman P., xxxxxx.
Jakes, Frank R., xxxxxxxx.
Jarrett, George A., xxxxxx.
Jarvis, Ronald J., xxxxxx.
Jenes, Theodore G., xxxxxx.
Jenkins, William M., xxxxxx.
Jennings, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Jensen, Harold E., xxxxxx.
Jensen, William C., xxxxxx.
Jewell, William M., xxxxxx.
John, Gilbert J., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Cornell, xxxxxx.
Johnson, Eugene M., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Frank F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Harold R., xxxxxx.
Johnson, James P., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Jodie, Jr., xxxxxx.
Johnson, John S., Jr., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Joseph E., xxxxxx.
Johnston, John A., xxxxxx.
Jones, Albert F. P., xxxxxx.
Jones, Charles L., xxxxxx.
Jones, Gordon D., xxxxxx.

Jones, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Jones, Thomas M., xxxxxx.
Jones, William D., xxxxxx.
Jordan, Aldy C., Jr., xxxxxxx.
Jordan, Donald R., xxxxxx.
Judge, Richard F., xxxxxx.
Junot, Arthur J., xxxxxx.
Kallman, Michael E., xxxxxx.
Kamakahi, Ronald D., xxxxxx.
Katayama, Robert N., xxxxxx.
Katt, Beaufort C., xxxxxx.
Keaton, Charles T., xxxxxx.
Keister, Leland W., xxxxxx.
Keith, Norman A., xxxxxx.
Kelley, Kent C., xxxxxx.
Kelley, Philip G., Jr., xxxxxx.
Kelley, William B., xxxxxx.
Kemp, Robert A., xxxxxx.
Kempf, Neil H., xxxxxx.
Kennedy, John D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Kennedy, John L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Kennedy, Walter G., xxxxxx.
Kennington, Roy A., xxxxx.
Kenyon, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Ketzler, Kenneth L., xxxxxx.
Kiefer, Charles A., xxxxxx.
Killion, Edward P., xxxxxx.
King, Ivan W., xxxxxx.
Kinnie, Irvin G., Jr., xxxxxx.
Kirkpatrick, Andrew, xxxxxx.
Kirkpatrick, James, xxxxxx.
Kitchin, James W., xxxxxx.
Kloke, John G., xxxxxx.
Klopp, Charles A., xxxxxx.
Kmiotek, George V., xxxxxx.
Knoebel, Frederick, xxxxxx.
Knox, Robert R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Knudsen, Joseph R., xxxxxxxx.
Kobata, Katsuji, xxxxxx.
Koch, Ralph A., xxxxxx.
Koen, Clyde H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Koontz, William E., xxxxxx.
Kostner, Raymond J., xxxxxx.
Koval, Emile D., xxxxxx.
Kracht, Peter M., xxxxxxxx.
Kramer, John C., xxxx.
Kretzer, Alonzo S., xxxxxx.
Kuhn, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Kunze, Melton H., xxxxxx.
Kupau, Richard A., xxxxxx.
Kupec, Edward W., xxxxxx.
Kwasigroch, John F., xxxxxx.
La Flam, Robert J., xxxxxx.
La France, Raymond, xxxxxx.
Labrozzi, Anthony, xxxxxx.
Lacquement, Hubert, xxxxxx.
Lair, Donald E., xxxxxx.
Lamastus, Robert L., xxxxxxx.
Lammie, James L., xxxxxx.
Land, Joe E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Landry, Clifford J., xxxxxx.
Lang, John E., xxxxxx.
Laray, William K., xxxxxx.
Larsen, David P., xxxxxx.
Larson, Richard A., xxxxxx.
Lawrence, Ernest, xxxxxxx.
Lawrence, Herbert L., xxxxxx.
Lawrence, Paul B., xxxxxx.
Lawrence, Richard D., xxxxxx.
Lawrence, Robert S., xxxxxx.
Lawrence, William A., xxxxxx.
Lawson, James C., xxxxxx.
Layne, Leslie A., xxxxxx.
Leach, Anthony J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Leaf, Edwin B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Leander, Richard C., xxxxxx.
Lee, James M., xxxxxx.
Lee, Wallace A., xxxxxx.
Lefebvre, Bernard R., xxxxxx.
Legener, Richard G., xxxxxxxx.
Leisinger, Richard, xxxxxx.
Leisner, Herbert W., xxxxxx.
Lembrich, Derald L., xxxxxx.
Lenassi, John R., xxxxxx.
Leonard, Richard E., xxxxxx.
Leonard, Robert R., xxxxxx.
Leuppert, Fred W., xxxxxx.
Levitt, David M., xxxxxxxx.
Lewis, Grover H., xxxxxx.
Lewis, William M., xxxxxx.
Light, Allen H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Lilliker, Thomas W., xxxxxx.
Lindberg, Charles F., xxxxxxxx.
Lindholm, Allen T., xxxxxx.
Linka, James E., xxxxxx.
Linkous, Claude D., xxxxxx.
Litherland, Ivan R., xxxxxxxx.
Liveoak, Felix L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Lodge, Thomas C., xxxxxx.
Logan, Francis S., xxxxxx.
Lopkoff, Alexander, xxxxxx.
Lotz, Alvin W., xxxxxxx.
Lowman, Charles J., xxxxxx.
Lowry, Montecue J., xxxxxx.
Lucas, Warren J., xxxxxx.
Lugenbeal, Leo H., xxxxxx.
Lundquist, Richard, xxxxxxxx.
Lynch, Gordon P., xxxxxx.
MacLennan, Robert, xxxxxx.
Mactagone, Serafin, xxxxxx.
Maddox, Chesley B., xxxxxx.
Magruder, Lewis F., xxxxxx.
Mahan, Gary C., xxxxxx.
Maher, John P., xxxxxx.
Mailler, James R., xxxxxx.
Males, William R., xxxxxx.
Malouin, Leon F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Manfre, Louis E., xxxxxx.
Mann, Everett E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Mann, Kenneth L., xxxxxx.
Manning, Monroe L., xxxxxx.
Manning, Thomas J., xxxxxx.
Manning, William J., xxxxxx.
Mansfield, Eldon L., xxxxxx.
Marden, Richard H., xxxxxx.
Marshall, James L., xxxxxx.
Martin, Donald R., xxxxxx.
Martin, Ephraim, III., xxxxxx.
Martin, John F., xxxxxx.
Martin, Robert N., xxxxxx.
Massengale, Eugene, xxxxxx.
Matson, Howard R., xxxxxx.
Matson, Hugo W., xxxxxx.
Matthews, Paul D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Maurer, William W., xxxxxx.
May, Edwin M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Mayer, Anton F., xxxxxx.
Mayhew, Charles H., xxxxxx.
Mays, George G., xxxxxx.
McAfee, Billy J., xxxxxxxx.
McCarthy, James E., xxxxxx.
McClean, Raymond J., xxxxxx.
McClelland, Thomas, xxxxxx.
McCluskey, James F., xxxxxx.
McCormack, Harold, xxxxxx.
McCormack, Robert, xxxxxx.
McCormick, George, xxxxxx.
McCurdy, Jasper M., xxxxxx.
McDermott, Francis, xxxxxx.
McDonald, Billy A., xxxxxx.
McDonald, Harold F., xxxxxx.
McDonald, John R., xxxxxx.
McElroy, Robert I., xxxxxx.
McGahee, Mack M., xxxxxx.
McGee, Charles F., xxxxxx.
McGillicuddy, Cornelius F., Jr., xxxxxx.
McGinn, Harry L., xxxxxx.
McGinnis, William, xxxxxx.
McGregor, Thomas, xxxxxx.
McGuffin, Robert F., xxxxxx.
McGurl, Peter W., xxxxxx.
McIntosh, John H., xxxxxx.
McIntyre, Graham W., xxxxxx.
McIver, James C., xxxxxx.
McKenzie, Colin W., xxxxxx.
McKinney, John W., xxxxxx.
McLennan, Stuart G., xxxxxx.
McLeod, John S., xxxxxx.
McMahon, John F., xxxxxx.
McMillen, James A., xxxxxx.
McNally, John W., xxxxxx.
McNeese, Luna V., Jr., xxxxxx.
McNeil, Frank H., xxxxxx.
McNeill, Charles L., xxxxxxxx.
McNutt, Donald L., xxxxxx.
McQuade, John P., xxxxxx.
McWhorter, James H., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
McSpadden, William, xxxxxx.
Meadows, Benjamin T., xxxxxx.
Mechtly, Ivan R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Medbury, Paul R., xxxxxx.
Meglen, John D., xxxxxx.
Mehl, Walter J., xxxxxx.
Meinhardt, Harry P., xxxxxx.
Meloy, Guy S., III, xxxxxx.
Menzies, Neil A., xxxxxx.
Meredith, Alvin L., xxxxxx.
Merrigan, Jack A., xxxxxx.
Merritt, Allen S., xxxxxx.
Merritt, Jack N., xxxxxx.
Metcalfe, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Metzner, Edward P., xxxxxx.
Meyer, Donald L., xxxxxx.
Meyer, Frederick F., xxxxxx.
Meyer, Richard M., xxxxxx.
Michael, Lloyd D., xxxxxx.
Middleton, Wilbur A., xxxxxx.
Mihalik, John A., xxxxxx.
Mihas, Leo B., xxxxxx.
Milam, Jerome C., xxxxxx.
Miley, James F., xxxxxx.
Miller, Clarence A., xxxx.
Miller, David C., xxxx.
Miller, John J., xxxxxx.
Miller, Leon M., xxxxxx.
Miller, Richard A., xxxxxx.
Miller, Thomas A., xxxxxx.
Minix, Thomas E., xxxxxx.
Miotke, William A., xxxxxx.
Mitchell, George W., xxxxxx.
Mitchell, William L., xxxxxx.
Mitchell, William H., xxxxxx.
Mitchum, Dwyer K., xxxxxx.
Moffatt, Edwin G., xxxxxx.
Moffett, Norman A., xxxxxx.
Mojecki, John A., xxxxxx.
Mollichelli, Edward, xxxxxx.
Monclova, Irving, xxxxxx.
Montrose, John L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Mooneyhan, Jack L., xxxxxx.
Moore, James B., xxxxxx.
Moore, James E., xxxxxx.
Moore, Peter W., xxxxxx.
Moore, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Moore, Wallace D., xxxxxx.
Moran, Conrad V., xxxxxx.
Moretti, Francis C., xxxxxx.
Morgan, Ernest R., xxxxxxxx.
Morris, Carl J., xxxxxx.
Morris, Hubert, xxxxxx.
Morrison, Clyde L., xxxxx.
Morton, Richard E., xxxxxx.
Moser, Alexander J., xxxxxx.
Moss, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Moulthrop, Robert M., xxxxxx.
Mountel, Robert A., xxxxxxxx.
Muller, Ludwig J., xxxxxx.
Murphy, Donald G., xxxxxx.
Murphy, Henry B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Murry, George S., xxxxxx.
Myers, Richard L., xxxxxx.
Myrah, Halvor H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Nabell, Eugene V., xxxxxx.
Nair, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Neal, Beverly L., xxxxxx.
Neal, Charles O., xxxxxx.
Needles, Paul E., xxxxxx.
Neff, Paul R., xxxxxx.
Neilson, Clifford C., xxxxxx.
Nerone, Francis A., xxxxxx.
Nesbitt, Thomas E., xxxxxx.
Nestlerode, George, xxxxxx.
Neuberger, Jack A., xxxxxx.
New, Guy E., xxxxxx.
Newman, Francisco B., xxxxxx.
NG, Richard, xxxxxx.
Nickolls, Charles E., xxxxxx.
Nicks, Jerry W., xxxxxx.
Niemann, Thomas E., xxxxxx.
Nims, Richard H., xxxxxx.
Noah, Max W., xxxxxx.
Noeding, John P., xxxxxx.
Nolde, William B., xxxxxx.
Nolet, Robert A., xxxxxx.
Noll, Wallace W., xxxxxx.
Norcross, John C., xxxxxx.
Nugent, Thomas J., xxxxxx.
Nunn, Thomas C., xxxxxx.
Nunnelee, Billy R., xxxxxx.
Oblinger, John B., Jr., xxxxxx.
O'Brien, James J., xxxxxx.
O'Brien, Thomas E., xxxxxx.
O'Connell, Leo A., xxxxxx.
O'Connor, Edward C., xxxxxx.

O'Connor, Mortimer L., xxxxxx.
Odekirk, Carl J., xxxxxx.
Odiorne, David W., Jr., xxxxxx.
O'Donnell, Matthew B., xxxxxx.
O'Donohue, John D., xxxxxx.
Ogg, Robert D., xxxxxx.
O'Karski, Gerald M., xxxxxx.
Okyen, Louis, xxxxxx.
Olsen, Edmund J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Olson, Arthur G., xxxxxx.
Opel, Donald M., xxxxxx.
Orr, Jerry C., xxxxxx.
Osborn, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Otis, Glenn K., xxxxxx.
Owens, Bidwell A., Sr., xxxxxx.
Owens, Lawrence B., xxxxxx.
Owre, Peter T., xxxxxx.
Ozaki, John, xxxxxx.
Palenchar, Andrew E., xxxxxx.
Pannier, Leon G., Jr., xxxxxx.
Papajohn, Carroll, xxxxxx.
Parker, David H., xxxxxx.
Parker, Walter E., xxxxxx.
Passano, John D., xxxxxx.
Patellos, Samuel W., xxxxxx.
Patton, William W., xxxxxx.
Paul, Alfred L., xxxxxx.
Payne, Delbert S., xxxxxx.
Payne, James A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Payne, James N., xxxxxxxx.
Pearce, Richard H., xxxxxx.
Peck, Darrell L., xxxxxx.
Perkins, John R., xxxxxx.
Perlow, Joseph P., xxxxxx.
Perrin, William S., xxxxxx.
Perry, William R., xxxxxx.
Peters, Perry E., xxxxxx.
Peterson, John R., xxxxxx.
Peterson, Russell B., xxxxxx.
Peterson, Thorwald, xxxxxx.
Petree, Neal C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Petterson, Charles, xxxxxx.
Petty, Howard P., xxxxxx.
Pfanzelter, Max R., xxxxxx.
Phillips, Ernest L., xxxxxx.
Phillips, James W., xxxxxx.
Phillips, John H., xxxxxx.
Phillips, William R., xxxxxxxx.
Phillips, William D., xxxxxx.
Pigg, Jimmy L., xxxxxx.
Pinney, David R., xxxxxx.
Pino, Amedeo R., xxxxxx.
Pins, Dwane F., xxxxxx.
Platt, Richard L., xxxxxxxx.
Pledger, Walter R., xxxxxx.
Plunkett, John J., xxxxxx.
Poe, Donald E., xxxxxx.
Pogoloff, Boris, xxxxxx.
Ponder, Arno L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Poor, William T., xxxxxx.
Poplin, Carroll B., xxxxxx.
Porter, Howard C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Potter, Edwin J., xxxxxx.
Potter, Russell C., xxxxxx.
Pratt, James R., xxxxxx.
Pratt, Joseph B., xxxxxx.
Pratt, Theodore W., xxxxxx.
Prevatt, Richard M., xxxxxx.
Price, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Priem, Charles M., xxxxxx.
Prillaman, John P., xxxxxx.
Prime, Charles W., xxxxxx.
Primm, Charles F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Pritchett, Charles, xxxxxx.
Proietti, Raymond A., xxxxxx.
Pruitt, James R., xxxxxx.
Pugh, Hilton E., xxxxxx.
Pugliese, Nicholas, xxxxxx.
Pulsifer, Donald W., xxxxxx.
Pulsipher, Elwin D., xxxxxx.
Pulver, Elmer W., xxxxxx.
Purcell, Henry, III, xxxxxx.
Purple, Robert A., xxxxxx.
Purrington, Donald, xxxxxx.
Quast, Lorus L., xxxxxx.
Queeney, Edward L., xxxxxx.
Quinn, Paul D., xxxxxx.
Raisig, Paul J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Rametta, Thomas P., xxxxxx.
Ramos, Domingo, xxxxxx.
Ramsay, Donald A., xxxxxx.
Ramsey, Leroy S., Jr., xxxxxx.
Ramsey, Phillip E., xxxxxx.
Randall, Douglas A., xxxxxx.
Randels, Dale K., xxxxxx.
Ranney, Frederick J., xxxxxx.
Rawlinson, William, xxxxxx.
Ray, William D., xxxxxx.
Ray, William E., xxxxxx.
Reade, John C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Rears, Joseph T., xxxxxx.
Rector, Lloyd K., xxxxxx.
Reed, Lynn M., xxxxxx.
Reese, Grady G., xxxxxx.
Rehman, Donald I., xxxxxx.
Reid, John A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Reinhart, William, xxxxxx.
Renner, William D., xxxxxx.
Rew, Leland C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Reynolds, Frederick, xxxxxx.
Rhyne, Hal B., xxxxxx.
Rice, David K., xxxxxx.
Richard, Donald W., xxxxxx.
Richardson, Ronald, xxxxxx.
Rickard, Daniel S., xxxxxx.
Rickards, Donald A., xxxxxx.
Riggs, Harold B., xxxxxx.
Riley, Clemens A., xxxxxx.
Riley, Otto N., Jr., xxxxxx.
Rinehart, Jack L., xxxxxx.
Rios-Matta, Luis R., xxxxxx.
Rittgers, Forest S., xxxxxx.
Rizzo, Paul J., xxxxxx.
Roark, Thomas R., xxxxxx.
Robbins, William C., xxxxxx.
Rodolph, John E., xxxxxx.
Rogers, Ellietson D., xxxxxx.
Rogers, John C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Rogers, Ralph W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Romedy, Cornelius S., xxxxxx.
Ropp, Ralph E., xxxxxx.
Roscher, William G., xxxxxx.
Rose, Llewellyn P., xxxxxx.
Rosenstein, Marvin, xxxxxx.
Ross, James K., xxxxxx.
Rothwell, John C., xxxxxx.
Roughen, Albert H., xxxxxxxx.
Rousse, William C., xxxxxx.
Routh, Elmer L., xxxxxx.
Rumbough, David H., xxxxxx.
Rumph, Horry L., xxxxxx.
Rumsey, David W., xxxxxx.
Rush, Early J., III, xxxxxx.
Russell, Lawrence, xxxxxx.
Russo, Frank L., xxxxxx.
Russo, Vincent M., xxxxxx.
Rutherford, Billy E., xxxxxxxx.
Rutkowski, Joseph F., xxxxxx.
Sajo, Alexander J., xxxxxx.
Sakayeda, Mitsuo, xxxxxx.
Salguero, Manuel M., xxxxxx.
Sammons, James O., xxxxxx.
Sampson, Eldon F., xxxxxx.
Sanabria, Robert, xxxxxxxx.
Sanders, Connelly, xxxxxx.
Sandidge, Charles R., xxxxxxxx.
Sandy, Roger D., xxxxxx.
Satchell, Max E., xxxxxx.
Satterfield, James, xxxxxx.
Sawyer, Donald E., xxxxxx.
Scalise, James J., xxxxxx.
Schmidt, Herbert R., xxxxxx.
Schmidt, Walter H., xxxxxx.
Schnarr, Charles A., xxxxxx.
Schnepp, William H., xxxxxx.
Schoebel, James G., xxxxxx.
Schotanus, Merle W., xxxxxx.
Schrack, Neil W., xxxxxx.
Schriever, Byron N., xxxxxx.
Schroeder, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Schroeder, William, xxxxxx.
Schultz, Arthur H., xxxxxx.
Schultz, Reed S., xxxxxx.
Schumacher, David J., xxxxxxxx.
Schuver, Rudy P., xxxxxx.
Schweitzer, Robert, xxxxxx.
Schweizer, Robert L., xxxx.
Scofield, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Scott, Thomas L., xxxxxx.
Segal, Robert, xxxxxx.
Seigle, John W., xxxxxx.
Selavka, Carl, xxxxxx.
Semerjian, Sarkis, xxxxxx.
Semerling, Ronald F., xxxxxx.
Semmler, Robert L., xxxxxxx.
Senich, Donald, xxxxxx.
Seto, Sam C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Sexton, Lionel F., xxxxxxxx.
Shattuck, William M., xxxxxx.
Shave, Kenneth L., xxxxxx.
Shaw, Donald E., xxxxxx.
Sheard, Joe H., xxxxxx.
Shelby, Roy E., xxxxxx.
Shellenbaum, Glen E., xxxxxx.
Sheppard, Irving T., xxxxxx.
Sherman, William G., xxxxxx.
Shields, Jack R., xxxxxx.
Shields, Roger J., xxxxxx.
Short, Frisco W., xxxxxx.
Shultz, Robert H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Shunk, William A., xxxxxx.
Sibley, James S., xxxxxx.
Siebert, Frederick, xxxxxx.
Sievers, Ralph H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Sifford, William F., xxxxxx.
Simko, Andrew M., xxxxxx.
Simkus, Anthony P., xxxxxxxx.
Simmons, John E., xxxxxx.
Simpson, Henry E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Singleton, Russell, xxxxxx.
Sinoff, Alvan C., xxxxxx.
Skaer, Kenneth L., xxxxxx.
Skanchy, Rex K., xxxxxx.
Skidmore, Lowell H., xxxxxx.
Skidmore, Marshall, xxxxxx.
Slusar, Peter, xxxxxx.
Small, Eugene F., xxxxxx.
Small, Harold I., xxxxxx.
Smallwood, Eugene F., xxxxxx.
Smartt, Richard W., xxxxxx.
Smith, Albert L., xxxxxxxx.
Smith, Bailey B., xxxxxx.
Smith, Billy R., xxxxxx.
Smith, Dan R., xxxxxx.
Smith, David C., xxxxxx.
Smith, Donald E., xxxxxx.
Smith, George K., xxxxxx.
Smith, James D., xxxxxx.
Smith, James D., xxxxxx.
Smith, Ralph H., xxxxxx.
Smith, Raymond C., xxxxxx.
Smith, Richard H., xxxxxx.
Smith, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Smith, Rodney H., xxxxxx.
Smith, Thomas L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Smith, Vernard J., xxxxxx.
Smith, William H., xxxxxx.
Smith, William F., xxxxxx.
Smythe, John D., xxxxxx.
Snead, William K., xxxxxx.
Snow, Robert R., xxxxxx.
Solomon, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Somers, Charles E., xxxxxx.
Sorbet, John W., xxxxxxxx.
Soukup, John P., xxxxxx.
Spang, Allan G., xxxxxx.
Spaulding, Stanley, xxxxxx.
Speir, Montgomery T., xxxxxx.
Spencer, Eucie D., xxxxxx.
Spilker, Wayne E., xxxxxx.
Spinks, Raymond F., xxxxxxxx.
Spotts, Rodney W., xxxxxx.
Spurlock, William W., xxxxxx.
Stalfort, Charles G., xxxxxxxx.
Stanford, Thomas L., xxxxxx.
Stanley, Davey L., xxxxxx.
Stanton, Thomas C., xxxxxx.
Starke, John B., xxxxxx.
Staum, Vernon E., xxxxxx.
Stearns, Clarence L., xxxxxx.
Steenborg, George A., xxxxxx.
Stevens, Richard W., xxxxxx.
Stewart, David T., xxxxxx.
Stewart, Donald B., xxxxxx.
Stewart, John R., xxxxxx.
Stillwell, John W., xxxxxx.
Stinson, William C., xxxxxx.
Stipo, Vito D., xxxxxx.
Stockelman, James C., xxxxxx.
Stone, Hardy R., III, xxxxxx.
Story, Billy L., xxxxxx.
Stoudemire, Harry B., xxxxxx.
Stoutamire, David F., xxxxxx.

Strauss, Stephan N., xxxxxx.
Stribley, Orrin R. J., xxxxxx.
Strickfaden, Wellington J., xxxxxx.
Stromfors, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Stromgren, Kenneth, xxxxxx.
Strouse, William R., xxxxxx.
Stuart, Dale F., xxxxxx.
Stuart, James R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Stuckey, Jack C., xxxxxx.
Suarez, Raymond, Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Suess, Philip M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Sullivan, Milton D., xxxxxx.
Sullivan, Roland R., xxxxxx.
Sullivant, Harold T., xxxxxx.
Suplizio, Paul E., xxxxxx.
Sutton, Thomas R., xxxxxx.
Sutton, William J., xxxxxx.
Swadell, Robert A., xxxxxx.
Swain, Carroll E., xxxxxx.
Swank, Robert D., xxxxxx.
Swanson, Carl O., Jr., xxxxxx.
Swecker, Gerald E., xxxxxx.
Sweede, Jack E., xxxxxx.
Sweeney, Kenneth J., xxxxxx.
Sydnor, Elliott P., xxxxxx.
Tanzer, John B., xxxxxx.
Tate, Wallace L., xxxxxx.
Tchon, Richard, J., xxxxxx.
Teal, James A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Tedlock, Billy L., xxxxxx.
Teller Floyd E., xxxxxx.
Tellifero, George J., xxxxxx.
Temp, John R., xxxxxx.
Tennant, Frank B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Terry, Bennett E., xxxxxx.
Tervin, Wallace, xxxxxx.
Tharp, Bobby E., xxxxxx.
Thomas, Joseph T., xxxxxx.
Thomas, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Thomason, David A., xxxxxx.
Thompson, Harry J., xxxxxx.
Thompson, Howard B., xxxxxx.
Thompson, James A., xxxxxxxx.
Thompson, William J., xxxxxx.
Thoreson, Dale B., xxxxxx.
Thrasher, Billy J., xxxxxx.
Thurmond, Herbert K., xxxxxx.
Tighe, Charles J., xxxxxx.
Todd, Edgar F., xxxxxxxx.
Todd, John A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Tolbert, James R., xxxxxx.
Tomlingson, Paul D., xxxxxx.
Tompkins, Hiram K., xxxxxx.
Ton, James G., xxxxxx.
Touchstone, Stanford M., xxxxxx.
Tourtillott Raymond D., xxxxxx.
Tower, John B., xxxxxx.
Trapp, Lawrence R., xxxxxx.
Treece, Frank L., xxxxxx.
Trepagnier, Jules C., xxxxxx.
Tuck, William A., xxxxxx.
Tullar, Thomas A., xxxxxx.
Turner, James J., xxxxxx.
Turpin, Billie G., xxxxxxxx.
Underwood, Bibb A., xxxxxx.
Valdez, Benjamin F., xxxxxx.
Van Camp, Joseph L., xxxxxx.
Van Deusen, Frederick F., xxxxxx.
Van Horn, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Van Meter, Maurice, xxxxxx.
Vance, Larkin B., xxxxxx.
Vander Meer, Richard G., xxxxxx.
Varnum, Charles S., xxxxxx.
Vawter, Raymond M., xxxxxx.
Veditz, Raymond P., xxxxxx.
Veley, Corydon A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Vernau, William F., xxxxxx.
Vernon, Graham D., xxxxxx.
Victor, Henry J., xxxxxxxx.
Viereck, Ennis A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Vilas, John R., xxxxxx.
Vorhies, Harold W., xxxxxx.
Wade, James P., Jr., xxxxxx.
Waldrop, Max L., xxxxxx.
Walker, James H., xxxxxx.
Walker, Ronald T., xxxxxxxx.
Walker, Theodore H., xxxxxx.
Walker, William E., xxxxxx.
Wallace, Festus E., xxxxxx.
Wallace, John C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Walsh, Alden C., xxxxxx.
Walsh, Eugene R., xxxxxx.
Walters, Monty W., xxxxxx.
Waltrich, Henry L., xxxxxxxx.
Ward, Edward W., xxxxxx.
Warden, Donald W., xxxxxx.
Wardlaw, Worth L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Warren, James R., xxxxxx.
Washington, Sylvester, xxxxxx.
Wasiewski, Richard, xxxxxx.
Waters, Douglas G., xxxxxx.
Watson, Elmer E., xxxxxx.
Watson, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Watts, William D., xxxxxx.
Weihmiller, William, xxxxxx.
Weikert, Jerry L., xxxxxx.
Welch, Joseph H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Welch, William J., xxxxxxxx.
Wells, Arthur D., xxxxxx.
Wells, David T., xxxxxx.
Wells, Don R., xxxxxx.
Welsh, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Wereszynski, Henry, xxxxxx.
Westall, Bynum P., xxxxxx.
Westin, Paul R., xxxxxx.
Westlake, Richard K., xxxxxx.
Weyland, Bruce M., xxxxxx.
Whann, John T., xxxxxx.
Whatley, Wayne B., xxxxxx.
Wheeler, Douglas E., xxxxxx.
Wheeler, William P., xxxxxx.
Whelan, William E., xxxxxx.
Whitbeck, Robert E., xxxxxx.
White, Richard R., xxxxxx.
White, Robert N., Jr., xxxxxx.
Whitesel, Thomas K., xxxxxx.
Whitmire, Roy A., xxxxxx.
Wieland, Kay L., xxxxxx.
Wielga, Stanley V., xxxxxx.
Wier, Melville B., xxxxxx.
Wild, Donald J., xxxxxx.
Wild, Julian S., xxxxxx.
Wilkes, Jack B., xxxxxx.
Willard, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Williams, Cyrus L., xxxxxx.
Williams, George E., xxxxxx.
Williams, Grady W., xxxxxx.
Williams, James E., xxxxxx.
Williams, Raleigh N., xxxxxx.
Williams, Roy L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Williams, Royce C., xxxxxx.
Williams, Thomas E., xxxxxx.
Wills, Robert V., xxxxxx.
Wilson, Alvin T., Jr., xxxxxx.
Wilson, Frank R., xxxxxx.
Wilson, Gene F., xxxxxx.
Wilson, Gerald F., xxxxxx.
Wilson, Jack D., xxxxxx.
Wilson, Joseph C., xxxxxx.
Wilson, Roosevelt, xxxxxxxx.
Winegar, Lucien T., xxxxxx.
Wirthlin, Floyd R., xxxxxx.
Wisdom, Donald A., xxxxxx.
Wise, John E., xxxx
Wisyanski, David A., xxxxxx.
Withers, Peter C., xxxxxx.
Wohlfarth, Howard K., xxxxxx.
Wolbert, Herbert K., xxxxxx.
Wollenberg, William, xxxxxx.
Wood, Charles C., xxxxxx.
Wootten, James P., xxxxxx.
Worthy, Clifford, Jr., xxxxxx.
Wright, Joseph, xxxxxx.
Wright, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Wubbena, William L., xxxxxx.
Yanamura, Kenneth K., xxxxxx.
Yantis, William J., xxxxxx.
Yetter, Greyson T., xxxxxx.
Yoder, Charles D., xxxxxx.
Young, Clarence J., xxxxxx.
Young, Clifford E., xxxxxx.
Young, James L., xxxxxxxx.
Young, John D., xxxxxx.
Young, John H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Young, John W., xxxxxx.
Youngker, Joe L., xxxxxx.
Zabcik, Franklin M., xxxxxx.
Zanghi, Joseph A., xxxxxx.
Zargan, Robert T., xxxxxx.
Zarnick, Dale L., xxxxxx.
Zeller, Leonard J., xxxxxx.
Zenz, Alexander R., xxxxxx.
Ziek, Thomas G., xxxxxx.
Zimmer, Charles E., xxxxxx.
Zimmer, Leon S., xxxxxx.
Zipp, Charles W., xxxxxx.
Zoeckler, William R., xxxxxx.
Zwicker, Ralph L., xxxxxx.

To be majors, Chaplain

Christoph, Edward J., xxxxxx.
Kriete, Charles F., xxxxxx.
Lamm, Harold C., xxxxxx.
Mueller, Edward M., xxxxxx.
Schmidt, Charles H., xxxxxxxx.
Willers, Ralph K., xxxxxx.

To be majors, Women's Army Corps

Babyk, Helena F., xxxx.
Barnwell, Shirley, xxxx.
Berry, Elizabeth A., xxxx.
Chong, Emma B., xxxx.
Devany, Rebecca B., xxxx.
Fisher, Audrey A., xxxx.
Kennedy, Elizabeth, xxxx.
Oliver, Williemae M., xxxx.
Priore, Renee L., xxxx.
Thompson, Martha J., xxxx.
Ziegler, Janet E., xxxx.

To be majors, Medical Corps

Abrams, Harold, xxxxxx.
Andersen, Stig B., xxxxxx.
Ballard, Anthony, xxxxxx.
Bartley, Joseph D., xxxxxxxx.
Bass, James W., xxxxxx.
Beach, Robert A., xxxxxx.
Bedynek, Julius L., xxxxxx.
Bergmanis, Juris, xxxxxx.
Birk, Thomas C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Bivens, Hollis E., xxxxxx.
Blackwell, Travis L., xxxxxx.
Blickenstaff, Loren, xxxxxx.
Bradley, Douglas D., xxxxxx.
Brierty, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Buchanan, Darrell S., xxxxxx.
Cadigan, Francis C., xxxxxx.
Canfield, Craig J., xxxxxx.
Cape, Richard F. T., xxxxxx.
Ceremsak, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Chaney, Samuel A., xxxxxx.
Chester, John B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Chipman, David W., xxxxxx.
Cox, Donald W., xxxxxx.
Cruse, Joseph R., xxxxxx.
Danaher, Thomas H., xxxxxx.
Darlak, Joseph J., xxxxxx.
Deller, John J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Dobbs, Olin C., xxxxxx.
Dossmann, William F., xxxxxx.
Downs, Peter E., xxxxxx.
Druepple, Leroy G., xxxxxx.
Duback, Richard T., xxxxxx.
Duffy, Michael M., xxxxxx.
Durden, Walter D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Easterling, Ronald, xxxxxx.
Fike, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Foster, Kendall W., xxxxxx.
Gangal, Mauro P., xxxxxx.
Garretson, Forrest, xxxxxx.
Gaskill, Harold V., xxxxxx.
Gillespie, Marion R., xxxxxx.
Gilliland, Paul F., xxxxxxxx.
Gleason, Raleigh R., xxxxxx.
Glenn, Guy C., xxxxxx.
Goodner, John W., xxxxxx.
Goumas, Melto, xxxxxx.
Gregory, Kelly G., xxxxxx.
Halling, Leonard W., xxxxxx.
Hark, William H., xxxxxx.
Heck, Francis J., xxxxxx.
Helfrich, Richard B., xxxxxx.
Henry, Thomas S., II, xxxxxx.
Henshaw, Dan M., xxxxxx.
Hertzog, James E., xxxxxx.
Hieger, Leroy R., xxxxxx.
Hunter, Ripley H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Inglis, William D., xxxxxx.
Intile, Joseph A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Egon V., xxxxxx.
Jones, Donald A., xxxxxx.
Kalas, John P., xxxxxxxx.
Kennard, John W., xxxxxx.
Keuls, Hans A., xxxxxx.

Kinn, William F., xxxxxx.
Kleanthous, Costas, xxxxxx.
La Follette, Bruce, xxxxxx.
Lavenson, George S., xxxxxx.
Le May, Sonley R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Lundberg, George D., xxxxxx.
Major, John E., xxxxxx.
Margiotta, Mark R., xxxxxx.
Marlowe, Julius F., xxxxxx.
Marsh, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Massarik, Ronald B., xxxxxx.
Mattei, Ivan R., xxxxxx.
McClelland, Ellis, xxxxxx.
McDaniel, Edwin C., xxxxxx.
McDowell, Milton K., xxxxxx.
McGough, Benjamin, xxxxxx.
McGranahan, George, xxxxxx.
McIlroy, William, xxxxxx.
McKlemurry, Cecil, xxxxxx.
Mehlhop, Fred H., xxxxxx.
Mittelmann, Michael, xxxxxx.
Modlin, Robert K., xxxxxx.
Moll, Joseph H., xxxxxx.
Mosley, Everett C., xxxxxx.
Moten, Franklin C., xxxxxx.
Murphy, William M., xxxxxx.
Newell, Robert C., xxxxxx.
O'Connell, Thomas J., xxxxxx.
Owyang, Allen, xxxxxx.
Patterson, Peter H., xxxxxx.
Peterson, James F., xxxxxx.
Po, Benjamin T., xxxxxxxx.
Pyke, Thomas W., xxxxxx.
Reba, Richard C., xxxxxx.
Robbins, Warren J., xxxxxx.
Robinson, Henry A., xxxxxx.
Robinson, James P., xxxxxx.
Rusinko, Andrew, xxxxxx.
Ryll, Erich D., xxxxxx.
Sandefur, John C., xxxxxx.
Sanford, Douglas M., xxxxxx.
Sarre, Stefan G., xxxxxx.
Schofield, Elliott, xxxxxxxx.
Scragg, William H., xxxxxx.
Shields, Charles E., xxxxxx.
Smith, Edgar B., xxxxxx.
Sowell, John M., xxxxxx.
Sower, Norman D., xxxxxx.
Stansifer, Philip D., xxxxxx.
Stutzman, Ray E., xxxxxx.
Taft, Foster H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Thoreson, Harlan T., xxxxxx.
Turner, John C., xxxxxx.
Tuthill, Dallas B., xxxxxx.
Van Norman, Russel, xxxxxx.
Virtue, Clarence M., xxxxxxxx.
Walker, Jackson K., xxxxxx.
Watson, Horace E., xxxxxx.
Webb, Charles R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Wells, Ralph F., xxxxxx.
Wengrovitz, Paul H., xxxxxx.
Wheeler, John P., xxxxxx.
Yancey, Henry A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Zlotsky, Norman A., xxxxxx.

To be majors, Dental Corps

Ahlvin, Reno A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Archer, Eugene G., xxxxxx.
Atwood, Robert B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Auzins, Janis, Jr., xxxxxx.
Barton, Ronald F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Belzile, Joseph D., xxxxxx.
Brady, John M., xxxxxx.
Carter, Harold G., xxxxxx.
Cavazos, Edmund, Jr., xxxxxx.
Chandler, Hubert T., xxxxxx.
Cochran, Robert M., xxxxxx.
Conner, Harold V. D., xxxxxx.
Cutcher, James L., xxxxxx.
Davis, Robert M., xxxxxx.
Deane, Clarence E., xxxxxx.
Fico, Anthony R., xxxxxx.
Floto, Edward E., xxxxxx.
Gallegos, Leander T., xxxxxxxx.
Genova, James J., xxxxxx.
Getter, Lee, xxxxxx.
Gore, Eugene, xxxxxx.
Hall, James, B., xxxxxx.
Hammond, Harry I., xxxxxxxx.
Hatchett, Robert K., xxxxxx.
Horton, John E., xxxxxx.
Howland, John P., xxxxxx.
Huey, Robert M., xxxxxx.
Hughes, Charles L., xxxxxx.
Hutchins, Dale W., xxxxxx.
Kamphuis, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Kopp, Edgar N., xxxxxx.
Lebourdais, Robert, xxxxxx.
Lefler, Billie B., xxxxxx.
Locke, Samuel M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Love, John W., xxxxxx.
Lucksinger, Henry C., xxxxxx.
Majerus, Roger V., xxxxxx.
Matthews, Kenneth L., xxxxxx.
McCasland, John P., xxxxxx.
Miller, Joseph J., xxxxxx.
Miller, Ronald K., xxxxxx.
Morrow, Raymond K., xxxxxx.
Oglesby, Erby R., xxxxxxxx.
Olivieri, Americo C., xxxxxx.
Palaszek, Casimir F., xxxxxx.
Paul, Charles L., xxxxxx.
Plegge, John, xxxxxx.
Purdy, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Qualman, Harold C., xxxxxx.
Radke, Ryle A. J., xxxxxx.
Rees, Terry D., xxxxxx.
Ross, Lincoln A., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Schallhorn, Robert, xxxxxx.
Schriver, William R., xxxxxx.
Shaver, Lloyd F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Shepherd, John R., xxxxxx.
Shimoda, Larry M., xxxxxx.
Swainson, Charles N., xxxxxx.
Tong, Edmund Y. S., xxxxxx.
Von Gruenigen, James A., xxxxxx.
Webb, Derril L., xxxxxx.
Williford, John W., xxxxxx.
Zelin, John R., xxxxxx.

To be majors, Medical Service Corps

Burke, James C., xxxxxx.
Burris, Carshal A., xxxxxx.
Drenner, Buckley L., xxxxxx.
Dyke, Lester M., II, xxxxxx.
Eigenberg, Alfred, xxxxxx.
Fisher, James B., xxxxxx.
Frus, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Gilley, William F., xxxxxx.
Gipson, Joe B., xxxxxx.
Gregory, Charles W., xxxxxx.
Griffin, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Grigas, Alfons A., xxxxxx.
Hatfield, Jimmy L., xxxxxx.
Heath, Jack F., xxxxxx.
Howlett, Byron P., Jr., xxxxxx.
Huth, Verlan E., xxxxxxxx.
Johnson, Marion P., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Wirt V., xxxxxx.
Kellel, Frank, Jr., xxxx.
Kershner, Edward C., xxxxxx.
Krueger, George R., xxxxxx.
Lesher, Edward R., xxxxxx.
Marble, David W., xxxxxx.
Meadow, Seymour, xxxxxx.
Medford, William D., xxxxxx.
Moore, A. Gordon, xxxxxx.
Mulrenin, Bernard K., xxxxxx.
Murata, Sunao, xxxxxx.
Noble, James W. H., xxxxxx.
Pedigree, Richard B., xxxxxx.
Petersen, Donald L., xxxxxx.
Plewes, William J., xxxxxx.
Quartin, Alfred, xxxxxx.
Rada, Roy A., xxxxxx.
Randolph, George B., xxxxxx.
Reber, John A., xxxxxx.
Reding, Donald J., xxxxxx.
Rocke, Donald C., xxxxxx.
Rusiewicz, Lawrence, xxxxxx.
Schiavone, Albert L., xxxxxx.
Seabourne, Thomas G., xxxxxx.
Vielhaber, David P., xxxxxx.
Walter, Fred L., xxxxxx.
Wright, John P., xxxxxx.

To be majors, Army Nurse Corps

Barnes, Oza E., xxxxx.
Bily, J. Marie, xxxxx.
Bloxham, Carolyn A., xxxxx.
Bluemle, Madeline L., xxxxx.
Brown, Inez M., xxxxx.
Carr, Mary J., xxxxx.
Cunningham, Dillard, xxxxx.
Davis, Mildred D., xxxxx.
Deming, Anne S., xxxxx.
Ekberg, Helen I., xxxxx.
Elko, Mary, xxxxx.
Ganow, Marie B., xxxxx.
Gonzales, Mary F., xxxxx.
Helmann, Eleanor M., xxxxx.
Houghton, Jean M., xxxxx.
Johnston, Jane H., xxxxx.
Keneson, Lorene F., xxxxx.
Kishpaugh, Barbara, xxxxx.
Kressler, Alta xxxxx.
Kumpf, Elizabeth, xxxxx.
LaBrecque, Virginia D., xxxxx.
Lewis, Agnes K., xxxxx.
Lewis, Betty J., xxxxx.
Light, Lucile M., xxxxx.
Lynch, Betty J., xxxxx.
Mahoney, Bettijane, xxxxx.
McCarthy, Rosemary xxxxx.
Miller, Martha P., xxxxx.
Montgomery, Roena, xxxxx.
Nelson, Dorothy I., xxxxx.
Perrin, Edna M., xxxxx.
Pritchard, Mary L., xxxxx.
Rogers, Janet A., xxxxx.
Sederowicz, Helen J., xxxxx.
Stallard, Sally M., xxxxx.
Swab, Wealthy E., xxxxx.
Theriault, Jeanette, xxxxx.
Trudell, Eileen D., xxxxx.
Welsh, Eleanor, J., xxxxx.
Wilson, Essie M., xxxxx.
Wilson, Marjorie J., xxxxx.

To be majors, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Accountius, Patricia L., xxxxxx.
Benson, Valborg M., xxxx.
Diggs, Mary M., xxxx.
Dwyer, Mary P., xxxx.
Fisk, Mary L., xxxxxx.
Kennedy, Annie F., xxxx.
Matthews, Nancy L., xxxx.
Price, Helen E., xxxx.
Ricker, Hetty A., xxxx.
Rodriguez, Ana L., xxxx.
Stearns, Barbara J., xxxx.
Strong, Corinne L., xxxx.
Van Harn, Mary A., xxxx.
Werner, Janet L., xxxx.

To be captains

Abramson, Lawrence, xxxxxx.
Ackerman, Rene J., xxxxxx.
Adair, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Adams, Frank S., xxxxxx.
Adams, James C., xxxxxx.
Adams, Ralph E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Adams, Robert T., xxxxxx.
Adams, William K., xxxxxx.
Adams, Wilsie H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Adderley, David L., xxxxxx.
Admire, Larry R., xxxxxxxx.
Ady, Samuel J., xxxxxx.
Aikman, Larry P., xxxxxx.
Ailles, Craig R., xxxxxx.
Akin, Jere H., xxxxxx.
Aldrich, Harold B., xxxxxx.
Alexander, Don R., xxxxxx.
Alexander, Joseph D., xxxxxx.
Alexander, William, xxxxxxxx.
Alfredson, George H., xxxxxx.
Allen, Cullen S., xxxxxx.
Allen, Donald K., xxxxxx.
Allen, Lee, xxxxxx.
Alling, James E., xxxxxx.
Allingham, Edgar R., xxxxxx.
Alston, Norman W., xxxxxxxx.
Altier, Robert E., xxxxxxxx.
Alves, Robert G., xxxxxx.
Amidon, Bert C., xxxxxx.
Amirault, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Ammerman, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Anderson, Edward, Jr., xxxxxx.
Anderson, James P., xxxxxx.
Anderson, Jimmie M., xxxxxx.
Anderson, Morris D., xxxxxx.
Anderson, Thomas W., xxxxxx.
Anderson, Warren H., xxxxxx.
Andrew, Ronald J., xxxxxx.
Andrews, Anthony J., xxxxxxxx.
Andrews, Raymond G., xxxxxx.

Andrews, William R., [redacted].
Andrews, William C., [redacted].
Anslinger, Raymond, [redacted].
Applegarth, Donald, [redacted].
Arbogast, Alfred A., [redacted].
Arbogast, William R., [redacted].
Archer, C. A., [redacted].
Archibald, Harold R., [redacted].
Archibald, Thomas, [redacted].
Arflack, Kenneth B., [redacted].
Armistead, John W., [redacted].
Armstrong, Donald R., [redacted].
Arndt, Gary L., [redacted].
Arnold, Joseph V., [redacted].
Ash, Hughes L., Jr., [redacted].
Auerbach, Ernest S., [redacted].
Averill, Ronald H., [redacted].
Avillar, Frank M., [redacted].
Ax, George R., [redacted].
Babcock, Charles S., [redacted].
Bailey, William N., [redacted].
Baker, Charles R., [redacted].
Baker, Larry A., [redacted].
Baldwin, Edward R., [redacted].
Baldwin, Max R., [redacted].
Balfanz, William F., [redacted].
Ball, James W., [redacted].
Ballenger, Kenneth, [redacted].
Bangerter, Jerald C., [redacted].
Banks, William J., [redacted].
Bara, Thaddeus J., Jr., [redacted].
Bare, George P., [redacted].
Barker, Robert L., [redacted].
Barnes, Holman J., [redacted].
Barnett, James R., [redacted].
Barnett, John R., [redacted].
Barnhardt, Davis S., [redacted].
Barone, Ercole M., [redacted].
Barr, Allyn J., [redacted].
Barr, Grady W., [redacted].
Barrell, Donald H., [redacted].
Barrett, Donald G., [redacted].
Barrios, Roy J., [redacted].
Barrowman, Thomas J., [redacted].
Barrows, Raymond R., [redacted].
Bartelt, Roger L., [redacted].
Barton, David C., [redacted].
Bates, John H., Jr., [redacted].
Bauer, David W., [redacted].
Baur, James F., [redacted].
Bayha, William T., [redacted].
Beakey, Danny J., [redacted].
Beal, William R., Jr., [redacted].
Beavers, Leslie E., [redacted].
Beck, William F., [redacted].
Becque, Peter A., [redacted].
Belan, Charles G., [redacted].
Bellis, Edward A., [redacted].
Beltz, Ronald A., [redacted].
Benca, John P., [redacted].
Benner, Carl A., Jr., [redacted].
Bennett, James L., [redacted].
Bennett, Larry T., [redacted].
Bennett, Thomas R., [redacted].
Benson, L. J., [redacted].
Benson, Richard D., [redacted].
Benson, Roy, Jr., [redacted].
Bergeron, Gary P., [redacted].
Bernstein, Charles, [redacted].
Berry, John A, III, [redacted].
Berti, John R., [redacted].
Best, David M., [redacted].
Best, James W., [redacted].
Bickford, James E., [redacted].
Biddle, David L., [redacted].
Bidgood, Ferdinand, [redacted].
Bierly, Robert N., Jr., [redacted].
Billings, Barry B., [redacted].
Bilyeu, Ronald E., [redacted].
Bireley, Judson L., [redacted].
Bisbey, Jay B., [redacted].
Bistany, Peter J., [redacted].
Bizic, Peter, Jr., [redacted].
Black, Joe D., [redacted].
Black, Ronald L., [redacted].
Blackstone, Anthony, [redacted].
Blake, Phillip L., [redacted].
Blanchard, Charles, [redacted].
Blanton, John R., Jr., [redacted].
Blevins, Dean S., [redacted].
Blevins, Virgil E., [redacted].
Blewett, John H., [redacted].
Blitch, William T., [redacted].
Bloch, Arthur L., [redacted].
Blondell, John V., [redacted].
Bloom, John D., [redacted].
Blue, Charles L., [redacted].
Bochnowski, Frank J., [redacted].
Bogart, William V., [redacted].
Boggs, James D., [redacted].
Boginis, James W., [redacted].
Bohach, John L., Jr., [redacted].
Bohi, Robert Y., [redacted].
Bohn, Joseph P., [redacted].
Bomersheim, Phil K., [redacted].
Bonifay, Isaac F., Jr., [redacted].
Bonner, John E., [redacted].
Booker, James A., Jr., [redacted].
Bosch, Brian J., [redacted].
Boucher, Arthur G., [redacted].
Bowden, John T., Jr., [redacted].
Bowden, Kenneth C., [redacted].
Bowen, Guy P., [redacted].
Bower, Robert M., [redacted].
Bowers, Joseph M., Jr., [redacted].
Bowersox, Wilbur G., [redacted].
Boyd, Claude D, III, [redacted].
Boyd, Richard K., Jr., [redacted].
Boyle, Clarence E., [redacted].
Boyle, David J., [redacted].
Boyles, Harry W., Jr., [redacted].
Bradley, Robert N., [redacted].
Bradley, William A., [redacted].
Brady, Edward J., [redacted].
Brailsford, Marvin, [redacted].
Bratton, Vernon W., [redacted].
Bratz, Gordon T., [redacted].
Braun, Thomas R., [redacted].
Bray, Robert F., [redacted].
Breeding, Joel W., [redacted].
Brennan, Ambrose W., [redacted].
Brennan, Patrick M., [redacted].
Brennen, Douglas L., [redacted].
Brent, John J., Jr., [redacted].
Bretsch, Kenneth P., [redacted].
Brewster, Horace B., [redacted].
Brindley, Peter, [redacted].
Brisach, Eugene M., [redacted].
Brokaw, Robert P., Jr., [redacted].
Brooks, Edwin C., [redacted].
Brooks, Joseph J., Jr., [redacted].
Brooks, Lawrence E., [redacted].
Broome, Donald F., [redacted].
Broome, John M., [redacted].
Brown, James H., [redacted].
Brown, Melvin H., [redacted].
Brown, Samuel L., [redacted].
Brubach, Charles F., [redacted].
Brugh, Larry D., [redacted].
Brumblay, Robert H., [redacted].
Brunner, Karl R., Jr., [redacted].
Brux, Gary H., [redacted].
Buchert, Kenneth D., [redacted].
Buckbee, Donald M., [redacted].
Buckley, Benjamin C., [redacted].
Buff, Max L., [redacted].
Buford, Alfred E., [redacted].
Bullock, Thomas L., [redacted].
Bumgardner, William, [redacted].
Bunten, Ralph T., [redacted].
Bunting, Bertram A., [redacted].
Bunting, Willis R., [redacted].
Burch, Fenwick H., Jr., [redacted].
Burden, John R., [redacted].
Burgin, Charles M., [redacted].
Burke, James A., [redacted].
Burkett, Jimmy D., [redacted].
Burley, Edward B., [redacted].
Burnell, Robert W., [redacted].
Burns, Robert E., [redacted].
Buschke, Thomas H., [redacted].
Butler, Billy C., [redacted].
Buzan, Thomas G., [redacted].
Byrnes, David F., [redacted].
Cacolice, John P., [redacted].
Cagle, Charles H., [redacted].
Cahill, Ralph D., [redacted].
Caldwell, Haskell W., [redacted].
Caldwell, Ora O., [redacted].
Calverase, Francis, [redacted].
Cameron, Carl H., [redacted].
Camp, Billy J., [redacted].
Camp, Junius W., Jr., [redacted].
Campbell, Albert, Jr., [redacted].
Campbell, Charles L., [redacted].
Campbell, Dan H., [redacted].
Campbell, Jack A., [redacted].
Campbell, Kenneth H., [redacted].
Canales, Fred, [redacted].
Canant, Raymond G., [redacted].
Candia, Ruben A., [redacted].
Cannon, Joe M., [redacted].
Caraballo, Julian T., [redacted].
Caravana, Richard R., [redacted].
Caraway, Lynn I., [redacted].
Carberry, James A., [redacted].
Carey, Arthur T., [redacted].
Carlile, Donald E., [redacted].
Carlisle, Allen D., [redacted].
Carmean, Clayton H., [redacted].
Carnaghi, Richard A., [redacted].
Carolan, James M., [redacted].
Carpenter, William, [redacted].
Carr, James A., [redacted].
Carr, Milton B., [redacted].
Carr, Richard M., [redacted].
Carron, Hector A,, [redacted].
Carter, Arthur P., Jr., [redacted].
Cartwright, Edward, [redacted].
Cary, John B., Jr., [redacted].
Cary, Martin W., Jr., [redacted].
Casey, John L., [redacted].
Cash, John A., [redacted].
Cassada, Thomas W., [redacted].
Castro, John P., [redacted].
Catineau, William J., [redacted].
Cato, Richard W., [redacted].
Catron, George R., [redacted].
Catt, Jackie D., [redacted].
Cerjan, Paul G., [redacted].
Chabot, Brion V., [redacted].
Chamberlain, Craig, [redacted].
Chamberlain, William F., Jr., [redacted].
Champ, Alan D., [redacted].
Chapman, Don C., [redacted].
Chapman, Gerald, Jr., [redacted].
Chapman, Ruthven H., [redacted].
Chase, William C., Jr., [redacted].
Cheatham, Fred C., [redacted].
Chichwak, William J., [redacted].
Childrey, Albert B., [redacted].
Childs, Leo M., [redacted].
Chitren, Vincent R., [redacted].
Chittenden, Warde P., [redacted].
Choplick, James R., [redacted].
Chucala, Steven, [redacted].
Chunco, William R., [redacted].
Chutter, Robert W., [redacted].
Ciccarelli, John E., [redacted].
Cincotti, Joseph G., [redacted].
Clark, Claude L., [redacted].
Clark, Jack T., [redacted].
Clark, Niles C., Jr., [redacted].
Cleaver, Donald E., [redacted].
Clement, Gregory C., [redacted].
Click, David L., [redacted].
Clifton, Jack H., [redacted].
Cline, Corwyn M., [redacted].
Clinton, James E., [redacted].
Cloud, Leon B., [redacted].
Clum, Keith Edward, [redacted].
Coates, Albert, [redacted].
Coats, William G., [redacted].
Coffman, Joe P., [redacted].
Cole, Raymond D., [redacted].
Cole, Robert H., [redacted].
Cole, Theodore R., [redacted].
Collins, Charles D., [redacted].
Collins, Robert M., [redacted].
Comfort, Gary L., [redacted].
Connor, George H., Jr., [redacted].
Connors, Francis X., [redacted].
Cook, Clyde L., Jr., [redacted].
Cook, Grady W., [redacted].
Cooke, Charles B., [redacted].
Coombs, John G., [redacted].
Coombs, Robert M., [redacted].
Cooper, Kenneth D., [redacted].
Coose, Alonzo, Jr., [redacted].
Cope, Robert C., Jr., [redacted].

Copeland, Clinso, Jr., xxxxxx.
Coppin, Thomas S., xxxxxxxx.
Costa, Joseph, Jr., xxxxxx.
Cote, Joseph R., xxxxxx.
Cottington, David C., xxxxxx.
Covan, James E., xxxxxx.
Covell, Stillman D., xxxxxx.
Cowden, Ronald R., xxxxxx.
Cox, Richard L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Crafton, Walter H., xxxxxx.
Cranston, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Crasto, Donald L., xxxxxx.
Cratty, William E., xxxxxxxx.
Crawford, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Cremer, Frank N., xxxxxx.
Cressall, William F., xxxxxx.
Crinan, James R., xxxxxx.
Crocker, Aaron O., xxxxxx.
Crocker, Donald J., xxxxxx.
Crockett, Ralph G., xxxxxxxx.
Crockett, William A., xxxxxx.
Croll, Gerald F., xxxxxx.
Cromwell, George E., xxxxxx.
Crosby, George T., xxxxxx.
Crossley, Ross W., xxxxxx.
Crow, John S., xxxxxx.
Crowley, Edward M., xxxxxx.
Crum, Edward W., xxxxxx.
Crump, John C., xxxxxx.
Crysel, James W., xxxxxx.
Cubine, Gerald W., xxxxxx.
Culp, Richard B., xxxxxx.
Cummings, Edward H., xxxxxx.
Cummings, Ezra C., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Cunningham, Patrick, xxxxxx.
Curbow, Stanton L., xxxxxx.
Curren, William F., xxxxxx.
Cypher, Ronald P., xxxxxxxx.
Daly, Charles F., xxxxxx.
Daly, William F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Danforth, William W., xxxxxx.
Daniel, Richard A., xxxxxx.
Danielsen, Theodore, xxxxxx.
Darden, Harold W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Darling, Merlin D., xxxxxx.
Dassonville, Curtis, xxxxxx.
Daum, Richard S., xxxxxx.
Davidson, James D., xxxxxx.
Davidson, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Davies, Michael D., xxxxxxxx.
Davis, Don M., xxxxxx.
Davis, Peter A., xxxxxx.
Davis, Russell H., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Dayhuff, Charles H., xxxxxx.
De Bolt, Harold F., xxxxxx.
De Loach, Javan M., xxxxxx.
De Paul, Anthony K., xxxxxx.
DeWitt, John L., III, xxxxxx.
Deagle, Edwin A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Dean, Arthur J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Dean, George A., xxxxxx.
Dearing, David P., xxxxxx.
Dearman, Charles S., xxxxxx.
Decko, Charles C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Dee, David D., xxxxxx.
Degner, Herbert L., xxxxxx.
Dellinger, George C., xxxxxx.
Denney, J. Thomas H., xxxxxx.
Devitt, John M., xxxxxx.
Devlin, Edward T., Jr., xxxxxx.
Di Gregorio, Anthony J., xxxxxx.
Dice, Denis C., xxxxxx.
Dice, Jack W., xxxxxx.
Dickerson, Michael, xxxxxxxx.
Dickey, Leonard H., xxxxxxxx.
Diduryk, Myron, xxxxxx.
Diebold, Jerome A., xxxxxx.
Dierickx, James E., xxxxxx.
Dillard, Franklin R., xxxxxx.
Dillard, Hugh B., xxxxxx.
Dilworth, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Dinsmore, Paul F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Dolan, Edmund J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Dollner, David V. H., xxxxxxxx.
Donaldson, Benjamin, xxxxxx.
Donlon, Roger H. C., xxxxxx.
Dooly, Billy B., xxxxxx.
Dorf, John H., xxxxxx.
Dorsey, Ira, xxxxxx.
Dorsey, James J., xxxxxx.

Doss, Lorenzo M., xxxxxx.
Doubrava, Roy G., xxxxxx.
Dougalas, James A., xxxxxx.
Douthit, Robert A., xxxxxx.
Downey, John T., xxxxxx.
Downing, David A., xxxxxx.
Downing, Peter S., xxxxxx.
Drake, Edmond H., xxxxxx.
Dreibelbis, Harold, xxxxxx.
Drewfs, Henry F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Drisko, Richard W., xxxxxx.
Driver, Lewis F., III, xxxxxx.
Drollinger, William, xxxxxx.
Drosdeck, John S., Jr., xxxxxx.
Du Pont, Arnold R., xxxxxx.
Duckloe, John H., xxxxxxxx.
Duckworth, Charles, xxxxxx.
Duerre, Chester W., xxxxxx.
Duey, William E., xxxxxxxx.
Dugas, Sidney P., xxxxxx.
Dukes, Donald L., xxxxxx.
Dunford, William H., xxxxxx.
Dungan, Avalon L., xxxxxxxx.
Dunham, Rockwood S., xxxxxx.
Dunn, Ralph B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Dunnington, Warren, xxxxxx.
Durbin, Jerome A., xxxxxx.
Durham, James M., xxxxxx.
Duryea, Lyman C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Dynes, John H., xxxxxx.
Eames, Robert F., xxxxxx.
Eckmann, Michael R., xxxxxx.
Edgette, Charles W., xxxxxx.
Edinger, Jerry D., xxxxxx.
Edwards, Robert R., xxxxxx.
Edwards, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Eggerichs, James M., xxxxxx.
Eggleston, Howard C., xxxxxx.
Elam, Fred E., xxxxxx.
Elder, Cecil W., xxxxxx.
Emerson, Lloyd A., xxxxxx.
Emery, Douglas E., xxxxxx.
Emig, Donald K., xxxxxx.
Emond, Rene J., xxxxxx.
Endicott, James A., xxxxxx.
Endy, Clarence E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Epley, Gerald G., Jr., xxxxxx.
Erbe, Henry H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Ericksen, Arthur R., xxxxxx.
Erickson, Richard A., xxxxxx.
Estes, Jimmie L., xxxxxx.
Estes, Robert F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Eubanks, Earl W., xxxxxx.
Eubanks, Herman T., xxxxxx.
Evans, Benjamin F., xxxxxx.
Evans, Charles H., xxxxxx.
Evans, Kenneth A., xxxxxx.
Everitt, Larry E., xxxxxx.
Eynon, Thomas F., III, xxxxxx.
Faery, Henry F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Fager, Leland E., xxxxxx.
Fairchild, James B., xxxxxx.
Fairweather, Robert, xxxxxx.
Fancher, Harry L., xxxxxxxx.
Fanning, John P., xxxxxx.
Farrell, Francis W., xxxxxx.
Fegan, Charles B., xxxxxx.
Felber, Joseph G., Jr., xxxxxx.
Fenton, Roland D., xxxxxx.
Ferguson, George A., xxxxxx.
Ferguson, Michael L., xxxxxx.
Fernald, John P., xxxxxxxx.
Ferns, Gary H., xxxxxxxx.
Fero, James P., xxxxxx.
Ferrari, Robert G., xxxxxx.
Fetkenhour, Gordon, xxxxxxxx.
Field, Michael F., xxxxxx.
Fields, Clinton A., xxxxxx.
Fields, Harold T., Jr., xxxxxx.
Fields, James C., xxxxxx.
Fields, William R., xxxxxx.
Fiero, Robert S., xxxxxx.
Finch, Vernon D., xxxxxx.
Fink, Jerry D., xxxxxxxx.
Finley, George A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Finn, Frank D., xxxxxx.
Fisher, Gordon L., xxxxxx.
Fisher, Thomas P., xxxxxx.
Fitzgerald, Joseph, xxxxxx.
Flanagan, Thomas P., xxxxxx.

Flanders, George W., xxxxxx.
Flannery, Eugene P., xxxxxx.
Fleming, Blaine T., xxxxxx.
Flora, John G., xxxxxx.
Florence, William E., xxxxxx.
Floyd, Howard J., xxxxxx.
Flynn, Dennis J., xxxxxx.
Follett, Franklin P., xxxxxx.
Forbus, Jere K., xxxxxx.
Fortier, Joseph E., xxxxxx.
Foster, Alton L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Fourson, George R., xxxxxx.
Fowkes, Reginald B., xxxxxx.
Fox, Nathaniel S., xxxxxx.
Foye, Robert, Jr., xxxxxx.
Francis, Robert G., xxxxxx.
Frasche, Louis D. F., xxxxxx.
Fraser, Howard D., xxxxxx.
Freeman, Larry M., xxxxxxxx.
Freihube, Garry R., xxxxxx.
Frerking, Joe A., xxxxxx.
Friesz, Leonard L., xxxxxx.
Frink, Dennis D., xxxxxxxx.
Fritts, Courtney R., xxxxxx.
Fritts, William D., xxxxxx.
Fritz, James E., xxxxxx.
Fry, Charles H., xxxxxx.
Furey, Bartley W., xxxxxx.
Furman, Daniel R., xxxxxx.
Furno, Jimmie F., xxxxxx.
Gabrysiak, Walter J., xxxxxx.
Gaffney, Richard L., xxxxxxxx.
Gagliano, Ross A., xxxxxx.
Galliers, Richard J., xxxxxxxx.
Gallup, Walter A., xxxxxx.
Garcia, Raymond J., xxxxxx.
Garner, George K., xxxxxx.
Garrity, John J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Garshak, Francis D., xxxxxxxx.
Garton, Edward R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Garvey, James G., xxxxxx.
Gatanas, Mark D., xxxxxx.
Gates, Richard H., xxxxxx.
Gee, John T., xxxxxxxx.
Geiger, John F., xxxxxx.
Geiser, John L., xxxxxx.
Geisinger, John L., xxxxxx.
Gennaro, Louis B., xxxxxxxx.
Gentle, Gary S., xxxxxxxx.
Gergulis, John G., xxxxxx.
German, Abraham L., xxxxxx.
Germann, Anthony C., xxxxxx.
Getgood, John H., xxxxxx.
Getz, Dwaine E., xxxxxx.
Giacoppe, George N., xxxxxx.
Gianelloni, Sabin J., xxxxxx.
Gibbs, John J., xxxxxx.
Gibbs, John S., xxxxxx.
Gigicos, Chris G., xxxxxx.
Gilbert, John C., xxxxxx.
Gillespie, Richard, xxxxxx.
Gillespie, Wayne G., xxxxxx.
Gillette, Samuel G., xxxxxx.
Gilliam, Taft R., xxxxxx.
Gilligan, Joseph M., xxxxxxxx.
Gilmartin, Michael, xxxxxx.
Gilmore, Ralph J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Girard, Valmore J., xxxxxx.
Glaser, Kenneth R., xxxxxx.
Gledhill, David W., xxxxxx.
Glenn, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Glidden, Richard C., xxxxxx.
Godwin, Bobby J., xxxxxx.
Godwin, James S., xxxxxx.
Goff, Dewayne B., xxxxxx.
Goines, Roy L., xxxxxx.
Good, Walter R., xxxxxx.
Goodall, Ralph E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Goodell, Peter N., xxxxxx.
Gordon, Thomas J., xxxxxx.
Gorham, Frederick A., xxxxxx.
Goto, Arthur K., xxxxxx.
Gottfried, Francis, xxxxxxxx.
Graham, Richard A., xxxxxx.
Graham, William C., xxxxxx.
Grande, Vincent G., xxxxxx.
Grant, David E., xxxxxxxx.
Grattan, Brian T., xxxxxx.
Gratzer, Bernard W., xxxxxx.
Graves, Forest V., xxxxxx.
Gray, Ronald E., xxxxxx.

Gray, Ted J., xxxxxx.
Grayson, Eugene H., xxxxxx.
Green, Edward R., xxxxxx.
Green, Frank D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Green, George O., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Green, Norris B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Greenwood, Everett, xxxxxx.
Greenwood, Henry V., xxxxxx.
Greife, John L., xxxxxx.
Grenier, Alfred F., xxxxxx.
Griffey, Joseph P., xxxxxx.
Griffin, Tracy W., xxxxxxxx.
Griffis, Fletcher H., xxxxxx.
Griffith, Eugene D., xxxxxx.
Griffith, Jack H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Griffith, Kenneth C., xxxxxx.
Griggs, Joe H., xxxxxx.
Grimmett, Norman D., xxxxxx.
Grones, Melvin J., xxxxxx.
Groves, Delmer W., xxxxxxxx.
Grundborg, Kenneth, xxxxxx.
Guest, James A., xxxxxx.
Guggenheimer, Max, xxxxxx.
Gulla, John F., xxxxxx.
Gunn, Lloyd R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Gunter, William J., xxxxxx.
Haber, Sigmund J., xxxxxxx.
Hackett, Robert T. G., xxxxxx.
Hagan, Craig A., xxxxxx.
Hagan, William M., xxxxxx.
Hagerty, Paul P., xxxxxx.
Halbert, Edward, xxxxxx.
Halford, John R., xxxxxx.
Hall, Charles A., xxxxxx.
Hall, John F., xxxxxx.
Hall, William N., xxxxxx.
Halley, Fred N., xxxxxx.
Hallihan, James J., xxxxxx.
Halus, Michael B., xxxxxx.
Hambric, John L., xxxxxxxx.
Hamilton, George A., xxxxxx.
Hammerbeck, Allan W., xxxxxxxx.
Hanne, William G., xxxxxx.
Hanson, Wayne A., xxxxxx.
Hardenburg, William, xxxxxx.
Hardin, Alva V., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hardy, Albert S., III, xxxxxx.
Hardy, Teddy J., Sr., xxxxxx.
Harnagel, William R., xxxxxx.
Harper, James R., xxxxxx.
Harper, William E., xxxxxxxx.
Harrington, William xxxxxx.
Harris, Bobby R., xxxxxx.
Harris, David H., xxxxxx.
Harris, Franklin N., xxxxxx.
Harris, Martin J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Harrison, Edward R., xxxxxx.
Harrison, Kent E., xxxxxx.
Harrison, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Harrod, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Hart, Edward D., xxxxxx.
Hartley, Bobby J., xxxxxx.
Harvell, Kenneth E., xxxxxx.
Hatcher, Michael J., xxxxxx.
Hawkins, Cyril A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hawkins, Lawrence R., xxxxxx.
Hawley, Rexford K., xxxxxx.
Hawn, Darryl R., xxxxxx.
Haycraft, Thomas J., xxxxxx.
Hayes, Ralph E., xxxxxx.
Hays, Loyd J., xxxxxx.
Hays, Robert O., xxxxxx.
Healy, Richard W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hebert, Frederick J., xxxxxx.
Heckman, George M., xxxxxx.
Hegerich, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Henderson, Arthur L., xxxxxx.
Henderson, John S., xxxxxx.
Hendrickson, Christopher P., xxxxxx.
Henigsman, David N., xxxxxx.
Heningburg, Michael, xxxxxxxx.
Henriques, Richmond, xxxxxx.
Henry, John F., III., xxxxxx.
Henry, Pierre E., xxxxxx.
Hepler, Leslie J., xxxxxx.
Herman, Dean A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Herman, Gene L., xxxxxx.
Hernaiz, Alfonso M., xxxxxx.
Herr, Wayne L., xxxxxxxx.
Herrera, Angel, xxxx.
Herrick, Curtis J., xxxxxx.
Herrington, Roscoe, xxxxxx.
Herrling, John P., xxxxxx.
Herrmann, Gerald E., xxxxxx.
Hervert, Richard J., xxxxxx.
Herzig, Charles W., xxxxxx.
Heuver, Robert G., xxxxxx.
Heyman, William, xxxxxxxx.
Hickman, Carlos W., xxxxxx.
Hickman, Stanford W., xxxxxx.
Hidalgo, Manuel A., xxxxxx.
Higdon, George P., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Hill, William V., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hiller, Donald R., xxxxxxxx.
Hilton, Kenneth R., xxxxxxxx.
Hinds, Jim E., xxxxxx.
Hipps, Gary W., xxxxxxxx.
Hixson, John A., xxxxxx.
Hoaas, John G., xxxxxx.
Hobbs, Dale G., xxxxxx.
Hodel, Gerhardt W., xxxxxx.
Hodge, David L., xxxxxx.
Hodges, Harvey D., xxxxxx.
Hoffman, James R., xxxxxx.
Hofrichter, Francis, xxxxxx.
Hogan, Donal D., xxxxxx.
Hohman, Roger D., xxxxxx.
Holbert, Billy W., xxxxxx.
Holder, Henry G., xxxxxx.
Holland, Patrick J., xxxxxx.
Holmes, Allen E., xxxxxx.
Holmes, Simon H., xxxxxx.
Honda, Harry T., xxxxxx.
Hooverson, Richard, xxxxxx.
Hopkins, John R., xxxxxx.
Hopper, James A., xxxxxx.
Horton, Leland H., xxxxxx.
Hosford, Larry D., xxxxxx.
Hosman, Henry R., xxxxxx.
Houle, John L., xxxxxx.
House, John C., xxxxxx.
Houston, Darrell G., xxxxxx.
Howard, Jimmie B., xxxxxx.
Howe, Robert D., xxxxxx.
Howell, Eugene A., xxxxxx.
Hoyt, Max B., xxxxxxxx.
Hubard, John B., xxxxxx.
Hubbard, Donald A., xxxxxx.
Hubbard, Jerry A., xxxxxx.
Hubbard, Johnny R., xxxxxx.
Huber, Thomas H., xxxxxx.
Huff, William J., xxxxxxxx.
Huffine, Melvin T., xxxxxx.
Hug, Jack P., xxxxxx.
Humes, Jack T., xxxxxx.
Humphrey, Richard A., xxxxxx.
Hunter, Howard W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hunter, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Huntley, John H., xxxxxx.
Hurry, Bruce B., xxxxxxxx.
Huse, Warren D., xxxxxx.
Huskinson, William, xxxxxx.
Hutchison, Joseph W., xxxxxx.
Hynd, John W., xxxxxx.
Ichiyama, Ronald S., xxxxxx.
Imes, Allan B., xxxxxx.
Irvine, Michael M., xxxxxx.
Jackson, Charles H., xxxxxx.
Jackson, Donald B., xxxxxx.
Jacques, Joseph N., xxxxxx.
Jaffe, Stephen G., xxxxxx.
Janszen, James H., xxxxxx.
Janutolo, Dandolo, M., xxxxxx.
Jarvis, Charles W., xxxxxx.
Jary, Roland S., xxxxxx.
Jascewsky, Joseph A., xxxxxx.
Jayroe, Glenn L., xxxxxx.
Jenkins, Joe E., xxxxxx.
Jennings, Ivan R., xxxxxx.
Jezior, Michael A., xxxxxx.
Jilbert, Gerald R., xxxxxx.
Johns, Donald L., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Alan E., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Anthony, xxxxxx.
Johnson, Charles C., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Frederick A., xxxxxx.
Johnson, James H., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Robert D., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Robert N., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Ronald D., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Victor V., xxxxxx.
Johnston, James D., xxxxxx.
Jones, Alfred P., xxxxxxxx.
Jones, Arland A., xxxxxx.
Jones, Arthur M., xxxxxx.
Jones, Daniel M., xxxxxxxx.
Jones, Dean C., xxxxxx.
Jones, Edward J., xxxxxx.
Jones, Jack L., xxxxxxxx.
Jones, Joel D., xxxxxx.
Jones, Louis R., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Jones, Ronnie L., xxxxxx.
Jones, William S., xxxxxx.
Jones, William J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Jorgensen, Kermit, xxxxxx.
Joyce, Larry E., xxxxxx.
Kahn, William, xxxxxx.
Kail, Richard L., xxxxxxxx.
Kaiser, George F., xxxxxx.
Kamerling, Richard, xxxxxx.
Kane, George R., xxxxxx.
Kane, John P., xxxxxx.
Kane, John R., xxxxxx.
Kane, Peter J., xxxxxx.
Kanemori, Claude H., xxxxxx.
Kanouse, James W., xxxxxx.
Kay, Edward C., xxxxxxxx.
Kazenski, John T., xxxxxx.
Keating, Albert C., xxxxxx.
Keefe, William A., IV, xxxxxx.
Keegan, Ambrose J., xxxxxx.
Keller, John, T., xxxxxx.
Kelley, Jack T., xxxxxx.
Kelley, Samuel P., Jr., xxxxxx.
Kelly, Patrick J., xxxxxx.
Kelly, Robert R., xxxxxx.
Kenney, Donald R., xxxxxx.
Kenyon, James F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Kerr, James E., xxxxxx.
Key, Gilbert N., xxxxxx.
Kieffer, George W., xxxxxx.
Kiernan, Thomas J., xxxxxx.
Kilday, John B., xxxxxx.
Killingstad, Karl P., xxxxxx.
Kincheloe, Samuel E., xxxxxx.
Kinell, Carl E., xxxxxx.
King, Eugene S., xxxxxx.
King, Jack J., xxxxxx.
King, Stanley L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Kinney, Linford N., xxxxxx.
Kirby, William D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Kirk, William M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Kirkland, Cleo D., xxxxxxxx.
Kirn, Paul L., xxxxxxxx.
Kish, Francis B., xxxxxx.
Kleese, Gene D., xxxxxx.
Klein, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Klimaszewski, Michael P., xxxxxxxx.
Kling, Larry V., xxxxxx.
Klingensmith, David, xxxxxxxx.
Knight, John M., xxxxxxxx.
Knox, Granville S., xxxxxxxx.
Kobayashi, Norman T., xxxxxx.
Kobza, Gene R., xxxxxx.
Koentop, Thomas A., xxxxxx.
Kopecky, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Kosiba, Leo M., xxxxxx.
Kouns, Darryle L., xxxxxx.
Krahe, Francis X., xxxxxx.
Krape, Darryl S., xxxxxx.
Krausse, Stanley D., xxxxxx.
Kress, Carl F., xxxxxx.
Kryzak, Raymond O., xxxxxx.
Kuhn, Wayne B., xxxxxx.
Kuklinski, Norman J., xxxxxx.
Kulish, Jon N., xxxxxx.
Kuypers, Thomas O., xxxxxx.
Kwasny, Philip M., xxxxxx.
La Blonde, George T., xxxxxx.
La Sala, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Labat, Roger J., xxxxxx.
Lacquement, Richard, xxxxxx.
Ladd, Eddie B., xxxxxx.
Ladehoff, Harold L., xxxxxx.
Lahde, Frank U., xxxxxx.
Laird, William R., xxxxxx.
Lamb, John C., xxxxxx.
Lambert, Harold E., xxxxxx.
Lamont, John R., xxxxxx.
Land, Vincent J., xxxxxxxx.
Landry, Larry J., xxxxxx.

Lang, Neil B., xxxxxx.
Langseth, Leslie G., xxxxxx.
Lanphear, Paul J., xxxxxx.
Lanzotti, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Lapins, Juris, xxxxxx.
Laposata, Joseph S., xxxxxx.
Larkins, James M., xxxxxxxx.
Larson, Christian M., xxxxxx.
Laurence, Edward J., xxxxxx.
Lawlor, James, xxxxxx.
Lawson, Billy R., xxxxxx.
Lawson, Edward K., xxxxxx.
Layton, Charles M., xxxxxx.
Lazdowski, Walter P., xxxxxx.
Lazzaro, Gerald J., xxxxxx.
Le Febvre, John A., xxxxxx.
Le Gath, Joseph S., xxxxxx.
Leary, Paul E., xxxxxx.
Lee, Gene H., xxxxxx.
Lee, George B., xxxxxx.
Lee, Henry, xxxxxx.
Leech, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Lehrer, Glenn H., xxxxxx.
Lemmer, John F., xxxxxx.
Lemoine, Jarod J., xxxxxx.
Lenti, John M., xxxxxx.
Leonard, Charles F., xxxxxx.
Leonard, Theodore J., xxxxxx.
Leonard, William E., xxxxxx.
Lethcoe, Gerald E., xxxxxxxx.
Letonoff, Victor T., xxxxxx.
Leuty, Ray S., xxxxxx.
Lew, James R., xxxxxx.
Lewis, Billie G., xxxxxx.
Lewis, Cleophus C., xxxxxx.
Lewis, Jerome X., II, xxxxxx.
Lewis, Larry M., xxxxxx.
Lewis, Ronald D., xxxxxxxx.
Lewis, Sterling M., xxxxxx.
Lewis, Terris C., xxxxxx.
Liberatore, Samuel, xxxxxx.
Lid, Dennis W., xxxxxx.
Liddle, Jack W., xxxxxx.
Lillie, Warren T., xxxxxx.
Lincoln, James B., xxxxxx.
Lind, Richard W., xxxxxx.
Line, Edward D., xxxxxx.
Linebaugh, John M., xxxxxx.
Linn, David L., xxxxxx.
Linton, James E., xxxxxx.
Little, Allan G., xxxxxxxx.
Littlewood, Arthur, xxxxxx.
Livingston, Gordon, xxxxxx.
Logsdon, Lawrence, xxxxxx.
Lombardo, Roy S., xxxxxx.
Loomis, Leonard J., xxxxxx.
Lorimier, Joseph M., xxxxxxxx.
Losa, Gene A., xxxxxx.
Lott, George B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Lotz, Reinhard, M., xxxxxx.
Love, Heilbron B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Love, William H., xxxxxxxx.
Lovell, James A., xxxxxx.
Lovsnes, Neal W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Lowrey, Mark P., xxxxxx.
Lowry, Mark, II, xxxxxx.
Lowry, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Lozier, Gary O., xxxxxx.
Luberacki, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Lucas, Joseph C., xxxxxx.
Luck, Gary E., xxxxxx.
Luck, Michael W., xxxxxx.
Lusky, Harold H., xxxxxx.
Luton, Charles G., xxxxxx.
Lyell, Richard L., xxxxxx.
Lyerly, Edward D., xxxxxxxx.
Lyman, Donald R., xxxxxxxx.
Lynch, David F., xxxxxx.
Lynch, David J., xxxxxx.
Lynch, Thomas H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Lynn, Frederick J., xxxxxx.
Lyon, Paul W., xxxxxx.
MacAulay, David J., xxxxxx.
MacGregor, Harry G., xxxxxx.
MacLachlan, Peter, xxxxxx.
Maddox, Edward R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Magee, Michael C., xxxxxx.
Maguire, Michael E., xxxxxx.
Majhan, Thomas, xxxxxxxx.
Maksimowski, Ferdinand, Jr., xxxxxx.
Malinoski, Joseph C., xxxxxxxx.
Mallardi, Robert N., xxxxxx.
Malmberg, James E., xxxxxx.
Malo, Armand E., xxxxxx.
Maloney, William H., xxxxxx.
Mandelbaum, Charles, xxxxxx.
Manely, James E., xxxxxx.
Mangum, Robert A., xxxxxx.
Marcinkowski, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Marcy, Spencer D., xxxxxx.
Marecek, George xxxxxx.
Marek, James A., xxxxxx.
Markham, William E., xxxxxx.
Marks, Samuel L., xxxxxx.
Marmon, Herman S., xxxxxx.
Marotta, Joseph R., xxxxxx.
Marsh, Nelson L., xxxxxx.
Marshall, Jerry V., xxxxxx.
Marti, John H., xxxx
Martin, Ernest L., xxxxxx.
Martin, Geary D., xxxxxxxx.
Martin, John A., xxxxxx.
Martin, Robert G., xxxxxx.
Martin, Williams S., xxxxxx.
Martinson, Juri, xxxxxx.
Martz, John R., xxxxxx.
Marvin, Charles G., xxxxxx.
Marwitz, Carl E., xxxxxx.
Mashburn, Richard, xxxxxx.
Mason, John T., xxxxxx.
Mason, Leslie P., Jr., xxxxxx.
Mason, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Masterson, Peter H., xxxxxxxx.
Matthias, Harold L., xxxxxx.
Matthis, Earl N., xxxxxx.
Mattox, James I., xxxxxx.
Mattson, Gerald E., xxxxxx.
Maurer, Raymond W., xxxxxx.
May, Billy W., xxxxxx.
May, Karl E., xxxxxx.
Mayhew, Ronald E., xxxxxx.
Mays, Jack M., xxxxxx.
Mayville, William C., xxxxxx.
McAllister, Robert, xxxxxxxx.
McAlpin, George R., xxxxxx.
McBennett, John P., xxxxxx.
McCahan, Alan R., xxxxxx.
McCann, Walter P., xxxxxx.
McCarthy, Daniel J., xxxxxx.
McColl, Archibald, xxxxxxxx.
McCollum, James K., xxxxxx.
McCormick, James P., xxxxxx.
McCormick, Michael, xxxxxx.
McCoskey, James L., xxxxxx.
McCown, John E., xxxxxx.
McDade, Richard R., xxxxxx.
McDonough, William, xxxxxxxx.
McDowell, James I., xxxxxx.
McElroy, George J., xxxxxx.
McEvoy, Edward B., xxxxxx.
McFarland, James W., xxxxxx.
McFaul, William N., xxxxxx.
McGaw, Hugh R. L., xxxxxxxx.
McGeary, Martin N., xxxxxx.
McGough, James B., xxxxxx.
McGowan, James J., xxxxxx.
McGrede, Aubrey J., xxxxxx.
McGushin, Edward F., xxxxxx.
McHugh, Richard K., xxxxxx.
McInerney, Richard, xxxxxx.
McKenzie, George R., xxxxxx.
McKinney, John J., xxxxxx.
McKisson, Raymond, xxxxxx.
McKnight, James G., xxxxxx.
McLeod, Ingram B., xxxxxx.
McLeod, Norman F., xxxxxx.
McMahon, Robert W., xxxxxx.
McManus, George H., xxxxxx.
McMaster, Ronald R., xxxxxxxx.
McNamara, William, xxxxxx.
McPeek, Donald F., xxxxxxxx.
McPhaul, Malcolm G., xxxxxx.
McPherson, Thomas, xxxxxx.
McQuaid, Ronald J., xxxxxx.
McQuillen, George, xxxxxx.
McSlarrow, James E., xxxxxxxx.
McWain, James T., xxxxxx.
Mease, Jennings H., xxxxxx.
Medenbach, Philip C., xxxxxx.
Meder, Gene L., xxxxxx.
Meder, William A., xxxxxx.
Medley, Ted, xxxxxx.
Mehrtens, Frederick, xxxxxx.
Melcher, John F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Melton, Kenneth F., xxxxxx.
Menzner, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Mercado, Robert K., xxxxxx.
Meriaux, Richard D., xxxxxx.
Merlick, Carroll W., xxxxxx.
Merlino, Carl S., xxxxxxxx.
Merrill, William B., xxxxxx.
Merski, Norman R., xxxxxx.
Middleton, Robert D., xxxxxx.
Mierau, Michael D., xxxxxx.
Miles, Paul L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Miller, Carl D., xxxxxx.
Miller, Dyson R. C., xxxxxx.
Miller, George P., xxxxxx.
Miller, Gerald C., xxxxxx.
Miller, John Z., Jr., xxxxxx.
Miller, Ronald A., xxxxxx.
Miller, Russell E., xxxxxxxx.
Miller, Terry M., xxxxxx.
Miller, Thomas H., xxxxxx.
Miller, Thomas H., xxxxxx.
Miller, Wayne R., xxxxxx.
Mills, David E., xxxxxx.
Miner, James F., xxxxxx.
Minutoli, John R., xxxxxx.
Mirkovich, Richard, xxxxxx.
Misura, John P., xxxxxx.
Mitchell, Stuart G., xxxxxx.
Mitchell, Tilden A., xxxxxx.
Mitts, Edwin S., Jr., xxxxxx.
Miyamasu, Paul K., xxxxxx.
Moats, Bruce E., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Moeller, Lawrence B., xxxxxx.
Moldaschel, William, xxxxxx.
Molskow, Thomas S., xxxxxx.
Monroe, Mark A., xxxxxx.
Montagne, Ernest R., xxxxxx.
Montgomery, Robert, xxxxxx.
Moody, John W., xxxxxx.
Moore, Charles L., xxxxxx.
Moore, Emmett, xxxxxx.
Moore, Frederick T., xxxxxx.
Moore, James L., III, xxxxxx.
Moore, John E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Moore, John W., xxxxxx.
Moore, Laurence V., xxxxxxxx.
Moore, Thomas P., Jr., xxxxxx.
Morabit, Joseph L., xxxxxx.
Morgan, Kearney H., xxxxxx.
Morgan, Lowell E., xxxxxxxx.
Morin, Reynold, xxxxxx.
Moritz, Thomas W., xxxxxx.
Morris, Edward D., xxxxxxxx.
Morris, Jimmy R., xxxxxx.
Morris, Richard C., xxxxxxxx.
Morrison, Don R., xxxxxxxx.
Morse, Thomas M., xxxxxx.
Morton, John A., xxxxxx.
Mosbrooker, Michael, xxxxxx.
Mosburg, Henry L., xxxxxxxx.
Mosher, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Mosley, Howard R., xxxxxx.
Mostek, Donald S., xxxxxx.
Mowery, Hartman B., xxxxxx.
Muehlberger, Albert, xxxxxx.
Mueller, Harold B., xxxxxx.
Mulholland, Robert, xxxxxx.
Mullin, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Mulvihill, William, xxxxxx.
Mumford, Jay C., xxxxxx.
Munson, Don B., xxxxxx.
Murchison, Richard, xxxxxxxx.
Murphy, William F., xxxxxx.
Murray, Louis J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Murray, William B., xxxxxx.
Murrill, Fredrik H., xxxxxx.
Musmanno, Francis J., xxxxxx.
Mussells, John D., xxxxxxxx.
Myers, Charles T., xxxxxx.
Naatjes, Clarence S., xxxxxx.
Naftzinger, Joseph, xxxxxx.
Narath, Helmar, xxxxxxxx.
Naumann, Walter E., xxxxxx.
Neal, George W., xxxxxx.
Neal, Paul G., xxxxxxxx.
Neesmith, Delmus M., xxxxxx.

Nehammer, Karl F., xxxxxx.
Nelson, Charles R., xxxxxx.
Nelson, Hugh R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Nichols, John W., xxxxxx.
Nichols, Lester D., xxxxxx.
Nickerson, John M., xxxxxx.
Nicotra, Andrew P., xxxx.
Nix, John U., xxxxxx.
Nixon, Charlie J., xxxxxxxx.
Noack, Richard R., xxxxxx.
Noble, George P., III, xxxxxx.
Nobles, Charles S., xxxxxx.
Noel, Thomas E., III, xxxxxx.
Nolen, James T., xxxxxx.
Northcutt, Melvin E., xxxxxxxx.
Nutt, Robert M., xxxxxxxx.
Oakes, William E., xxxxxx.
O'Connell, James T., xxxxxx.
O'Connell, Thomas R., xxxxxx.
O'Connor, Patrick M., xxxxxx.
O'Connor, Thomas H., xxxxxx.
O'Dwyer, Roger, P. J., xxxxxxxx.
Oelschig, Carl H., xxxxxxxx.
Oerding, James B., xxxxxx.
Ogg, Paul C., xxxxxx.
O'Hara, Thomas C., xxxxxx.
O'Kane, Michael L., xxxxxx.
O'Keefe, Edward T., Jr., xxxxxx.
O'Keefe, Joseph D., xxxxxx.
Oliver, John H., xxxxxx.
O'Malley, Thomas K., xxxxxx.
Orr, Danford M., xxxxxx.
Orsini-Navas, Mario, xxxxxxxx.
Osborn, Larry N., xxxxxxxx.
Ostick, Charles T., xxxxxx.
Ostien, Douglas B., xxxxxx.
Oswandel, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Otstott, Charles P., xxxxxx.
Oura, Donald M., xxxxxxxx.
Overgard, Richard N., xxxxxx.
Overholser, William, xxxxxx.
Owens, Bobby L., xxxxxx.
Owens, William B., xxxxxx.
Painter, Donald E., xxxxxx.
Palsha, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Paquette, Edward H., xxxxxx.
Parker, Eliot V., Jr., xxxxxx.
Parker, Frank W., xxxxxx.
Parker, Henry B., xxxxxx.
Parker, Neal G., xxxxxx.
Parkhurst, Henry A., xxxxxx.
Parnell, William C., xxxx.
Parr, Gary K., xxxxxx.
Parsley, Benjamin L., xxxxxx.
Parsons, Donald L., xxxxxx.
Partlow, Frank A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Pate, Rupert E., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Patten, Jerry W., xxxxxx.
Patterson, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Patty, J. W. III, xxxxxxxx.
Paul, Bruce O., xxxxxxxx.
Pauli, John T., xxxxxxxx.
Paulsen, Hans W., xxxxxx.
Payne, Guy H., xxxxxx.
Payne, Herbert M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Pearce, David L., xxxxxx.
Pearson, John E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Pelino, Philip E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Pellicci, Jack A., xxxxxx.
Pendarvis, Donald R., xxxxxx.
Pepe, Michael J., xxxxxx.
Peppers, John S., xxxxxx.
Perez-Lebron, Hector, xxxxxxxx.
Perkins, Randall A., xxxxxx.
Peters, Shelton V., xxxxxx.
Phalen, James R., xxxxxxxx.
Phelan, Frank J., xxxxxx.
Phillips, Alan B., xxxxxx.
Phillips, Henry A., xxxxxx.
Piatak, John R., xxxxxx.
Pierce, Harlan L., xxxxxx.
Pike, Gerald D., xxxxxx.
Pike, Thurston E., xxxxxx.
Pingry, Thomas E., xxxxxx.
Piper, Larry D., xxxxxx.
Place, Darman C., xxxxxx.
Plaster, Roy C., xxxxxx.
Plummer, Frederick, xxxxxx.
Plummer, Michael T., xxxxxx.
Polk, Burley R., xxxxxx.
Polk, John A., xxxxxx.
Pollard, Thomas L., xxxxxx.
Pool, Russell F., xxxxxx.
Pope, Fred R., xxxxxx.
Porter, Norman A., xxxxxx.
Post, Elwyn D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Post, Richard B., xxxxxx.
Potter, Anthony D., xxxxxxxx.
Potter, Donald C., xxxxxx.
Powers, Richard J., xxxxxxxx.
Pozzi, Ronald J., xxxxxxxx.
Prall, Eric L., xxxxxx.
Preetorius, Charles, xxxxxx.
Presley, John R., xxxxxx.
Preston, Edward G., xxxxxx.
Proctor, Michael J., xxxxxxxx.
Pursel, Terry C., xxxxxx.
Queeney, Richard K., xxxxxx.
Quickel, Jacob C., xxxxxx.
Quinlan, John G., xxxxxx.
Rabon, Jim D., xxxxxx.
Race, Gary L., xxxxxx.
Rader, Allan L., xxxxxxxx.
Radike, David N., xxxxxx.
Raley, Michael D., xxxxxx.
Ralphs, William J., xxxxxx.
Ramirez, Arnoldo R., xxxxxx.
Ramos, James R., xxxxxx.
Ranney, Thomas A., xxxxxx.
Rapp, Edward G., xxxxxx.
Rappaport, Arthur N., xxxxxx.
Rau, Raymond R., xxxxxx.
Ray, Thomas L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Raymond, Charles W., xxxxxx.
Raymond, William M., xxxxxx.
Ream, David W., xxxxxxxx.
Reber, John L., xxxxxx.
Redden, Thomas W., xxxxxxxx.
Redemann, David H., xxxxxx.
Reece, Frank S., xxxxxx.
Reed, David B., III, xxxxxx.
Reed, Henry M., II, xxxxxx.
Reedy, Clyde M., xxxxxx.
Reeves, Troy, Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Rego, Chris F., xxxxxx.
Reiber, Carl F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Reid, John C., xxxxxx.
Reuter, Neil G., xxxxxx.
Reynolds, Buddy L., xxxxxx.
Reynolds, Joseph C., xxxxxx.
Reynolds, Sonny D., xxxxxx.
Rhoads, David G., xxxxxxxx.
Rhynsburger, Robert, xxxxxx.
Rice, Bert L., xxxxxx.
Rice, Frederick C., xxxxxx.
Rice, Howard P., Jr., xxxxxx.
Rice, Leonard E., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Rice, Paul J., xxxxxxxx.
Rich, Terrence L., xxxxxx.
Richards, Donald R., xxxxxx.
Richardson, Charles, xxxxxx.
Richeson, Alfred K., xxxxxx.
Richard, Wayne R., xxxxxx.
Rider, Frank W., xxxxxx.
Riley, Donald A., xxxxxx.
Riley, Frank J., xxxxxx.
Riley, James M., xxxxxx.
Riley, Larry L., xxxxxx.
Rippetoe, Joe F., xxxxxx.
Risley, Dannie J., xxxxxx.
Ritchie, William L., xxxxxx.
Rizzo, Charles, xxxxxxxx.
Robbins, Chandler P., xxxxxx.
Roberts, James E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Roberts, Paul A., xxxxxx.
Robertson, Edward H., xxxxxx.
Robins, Philip L., xxxxxxxx.
Robinson, Charles D., xxxxxx.
Robocker, William W., xxxxxx.
Rochester, James V., xxxxxx.
Roeder, Helmut A. G., xxxxxx.
Rogers, Jack D., xxxxxx.
Rogers, Martin M., xxxxxx.
Rogers, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Rose, Louis, xxxxxx.
Rose, Wilbur V., xxxxxx.
Ross, Barry D., xxxxxxxx.
Rossi, Arnold T., xxxxxx.
Rossman, Jack, xxxxxx.
Rovan, William P., xxxxxx.
Rowe, James N., xxxxxx.
Rowland, Jerry D., xxxxxx.
Roy, Daniel S., xxxxxx.
Rudesill, Robert S., xxxxxx.
Ruedel, William P., xxxxxx.
Russell, Donald A., xxxxxxxx.
Ruszkiewicz, John J., xxxxxxxx.
Rux, William A., II, xxxxxx.
Ryan, Michael T., xxxxxx.
Ryan, Roger M., xxxxxx.
Rydberg, Carl R., xxxxxx.
Saathoff, Donald I., xxxxxx.
Safford, Donald B., xxxxxx.
Sartori, Victor P., xxxxxx.
Sasai, Calvin Y., xxxxxx.
Savio, Paul J., xxxxxx.
Scanlon, Charlie F., xxxxxx.
Schaaf, James C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Schafer, Donald D., xxxxxxxx.
Schatzman, Thomas F., xxxxxx.
Scheel, Clarence A., xxxxxxxx.
Schiemann, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Schimming, James L., xxxxxx.
Schlaak, Thomas M., xxxxxx.
Schmidt, Jackie E., xxxxxx.
Schmidt, Leroy A., xxxxxx.
Schmidt, William A., xxxxxxxx.
Schmidtman, Michael, xxxxx.
Schooff, Maury W., xxxxxx.
Schrauth, Michael R., xxxxxxxx.
Schroeder, Frederick, xxxxxx.
Schrum, James R., xxxxxxxx.
Schuetz, Terry L., xxxxxx.
Schuler, William D., xxxxxx.
Schumaker, John R., xxxxxx.
Schumann, Lawrence, xxxxxx.
Schumpert, Gilbert, xxxxxx.
Schwan, Richard J., xxxxxxxx.
Schwartz, Daniel, xxxxxx.
Schwarzenbach, Malcolm P., Jr., xxxxxx.
Schwoob, James F., xxxxxx.
Scott, Engle W., xxxxxx.
Scott, Ernest K., xxxxxx.
Scott, Hugh J., xxxxxx.
Scott, Stephen H., xxxxxx.
Scott, Walter S., xxxxxx.
Scudder, William I., xxxxxx.
Searles, Jonathan W., xxxxxx.
Seaver, James R., xxxxxx.
Seaward, Richard S., xxxxxx.
Seiler, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Sellers, Robert P., xxxxxx.
Sexton, William T., xxxxxx.
Seymour, Roger G., xxxxxx.
Shachnow, Sidney, xxxxxx.
Shafer, Harold S., xxxxxx.
Shalikashvili, John, xxxxxx.
Shaul, Charles D., xxxxxx.
Shaw, Gene C., xxxxxx.
Sheldon, Thomas K., xxxxxx.
Shepherd, Billy J., xxxxxx.
Sheppeck, Michael L., xxxxxx.
Sherman, William M., xxxxxx.
Sherrod, Dale E., xxxxxxxx.
Shevlin, George L., xxxxxx.
Shimek, Daniel W., xxxxxx.
Shine, Joseph P., xxxxxx.
Shirley, William A., xxxxxxxx.
Shost, Alan T., xxxx.
Shuey, Richard P., xxxxxx.
Siebert, Edward M., xxxxxx.
Siegel, Herbert, xxxxxxxx.
Siegling, William A., xxxxxxxx.
Sills, Edward G., xxxxxx.
Simmons, Denis L., xxxxxx.
Simon, Benjamin J., xxxxxx.
Simpson, Andrew R., xxxxxx.
Simpson, Felix D., xxxxxx.
Simpson, Leoren, xxxxxx.
Simpson, William C., xxxxxx.
Sines, Kenneth A., xxxxxxxx.
Skamser, Harold P., xxxxxx.
Skillings, James A., xxxxxx.
Skinner, William J., xxxxxx.
Slaby, Charles O., Jr., xxxxxx.
Slattery, Stephen M., xxxxxx.
Sloan, Jimmy B., xxxxxx.
Slovacek, Anthony S., xxxxxx.
Smallen, Ray H., xxxxxx.
Smathers, Sam T., xxxxxx.
Smayda, William A., xxxxxx.
Smith, Curtis, S., xxxxxx.

Smith, Daniel A., xxxxxx.
Smith, Donald E., xxxxxx.
Smith, Harold B., xxxxxx.
Smith, Harold L., xxxxxx.
Smith, Horace A., xxxxxxxx.
Smith, John R., xxxxxx.
Smith, Richard A., xxxxxx.
Smith, Vernelle T., xxxxxx.
Snow, Edward F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Sodano, Guy R., xxxxxx.
Soland, Donald J., xxxxxx.
Soli, Thomas R., xxxxxx.
Solliday, Charles W., xxxxxx.
Sorensen, Ralph L., xxxxxx.
Sorini, Laurence F., xxxxxx.
Southern, Kermitt E., xxxxxxxx.
Southworth, James V., xxxxxx.
Sowell, James L., xxxxxx.
Sowle, Peter H., xxxxxxxx.
Spain, William H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Spak, Michael I., xxxxxxxx.
Spann, Juan W., xxxxxx.
Speedie, John C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Spigelmire, Michael, xxxxxx.
Spillane, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Spitzer, Joel S., xxxxxx.
Spivy, Berton E., III, xxxxxx.
Sponseller, James M., xxxxxxxx.
Sprengeler, Ronald, xxxxxx.
Springer, Anthony T., xxxxxx.
Squire, Joseph W., xxxxxx.
Stafford, Benjamin, xxxxxx.
Stahlman, John R., xxxxxx.
Stanfill, James H., xxxxxx.
Stang, Arthur C., III, xxxxxx.
Starling, James D., xxxxxx.
Stauber, Jerome E., xxxxxx.
Stearns, Raymond L., xxxxxx.
Steed, John H., xxxxxx.
Stehling, Joseph M., xxxxxx.
Steiger, Donald W., xxxxxxxx.
Stem, David H., xxxxxx.
Stephens, Donald G., xxxxxxxx.
Stephens, William J., xxxxxx.
Stetson, Sterling L., xxxxxxxx.
Stewart, James M., xxxxxx.
Stewart, Randall J., xxxxxx.
Stiepock, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Stiles, Charles E., xxxxxxxx.
Stilwell, Joseph W., xxxxxx.
Stocker, William L., xxxxxx.
Stockman, William L., xxxxxx.
Stofft, William A., xxxxxxxx.
Stokes, Orville P., xxxxxx.
Stone, James E., xxxxxxxx.
Stout, Louis E., xxxxxx.
Stovall, Rayburn C., xxxxxx.
Stowe, Wain W., xxxxxx.
Straetz, Donald F., xxxxxx.
Straight, Kaye R., xxxxxx.
Strimbu, George, xxxxxx.
Strong, Edward M., xxxxxx.
Strother, James O., xxxxxx.
Struck, Larry D., xxxx
Strzelecki, Leonard, xxxxxx.
Stuart, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Stulga, Charles A., xxxxxx.
Sturek, Walter B., xxxxxx.
Sturgeon, Charles E., xxxxxx.
Sugdinis, Joel E., xxxxxx.
Sullenger, Lawrence, xxxxxx.
Sullivan, Anthony D., xxxxxx.
Sullivan, Gordon R., xxxxxx.
Sullivan, James A., xxxxxx.
Summers, Don A., xxxxxx.
Sumner, John H., xxxxxx.
Suter, William K., xxxxxx.
Sutton, Richard O., xxxxxx.
Swart, Oura L., xxxxxxxx.
Swygert, John F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Symons, John W., xxxxxx.
Symons, Rodney W., xxxxxxxx.
Szabo, Richard M., xxxxxx.
Taggart, Homer G., xxxxxx.
Tamplin, William F., xxxxxx.
Tancreti, Roger J., xxxxxx.
Tanner, Junius I., xxxxxx.
Tanner, Walter D., xxxxxxxx.
Taylor, Horace G., xxxxxx.
Taylor, James E., xxxxxx.
Taylor, John N., xxxxxx.
Taylor, Robert P., xxxxxx.
Taylor, Vernon K., xxxxxx.
Teates, Bryan W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Tenbrook, James J., xxxxxx.
Terry, Frederick G., xxxxxx.
Teska, Thomas E., xxxxxx.
Thacker, James F., xxxxxx.
Theofanous, Angelo, xxxxxxxx.
Thomas, Bobby F., xxxxxx.
Thomas, Donald W., xxxxxx.
Thomas, James E., xxxxxx.
Thompson, Francis J., xxxxxx.
Thompson, James B., xxxxxxxx.
Thompson, Richard A., xxxxxx.
Thornton, William F., xxxxxx.
Throckmorton, Thomas B., xxxxxx.
Thurgood, Leon C., xxxxxx.
Thurston, Joe B., Jr., xxxx
Tichenor, James R., xxxxxx.
Timmerman, Benjamin, xxxxxx.
Titus, Charles M., xxxxxx.
Todd, John J., xxxxxxx.
Totolo, Robert C., xxxxxxxx.
Totten, Robert G., xxxxxx.
Touhey, Henry J., xxxxxxxx.
Tozer, William S., xxxxxx.
Tracy, Lawrence L., xxxxxx.
Trang, Myron L., xxxxxxxx.
Trauner, Ronald F., xxxxxx.
Trautmann, Eugene O., xxxxxx.
Traver, Donald J., xxxxxx.
Trebbe, John M., xxxxxx.
Trickett, Frederick, xxxxxx.
Trodella, Robert A., xxxxxx.
Trout, Nelson C., xxxxxxxx.
Trudell, John A., xxxxxx.
Tudhope, Lawrence K., xxxxxx.
Tudor, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Tuxill, Richard W., xxxxxx.
Ulm, Donald S., xxxxxx.
Vaglia, James E., xxxxxx.
Valente, Thomas E., xxxxxx.
Valliant, Charles M., xxxxxx.
Van Amburgh, Gordon, xxxxxx.
Van Dine, Peter W. H., xxxxxx.
Van Eynde, Donald F., xxxxxx.
Van Zee, James L., xxxxxx.
Vanderslice, Gary E., xxxx
Vargosko, Michael A., xxxxxx.
Varnon, Jerry R., xxxxxx.
Vela, Rena A., xxxxxx.
Vencill, William A., xxxxxx.
Vercellone, Joseph, xxxxxx.
Vermilyea, Carl P., xxxxxx.
Vespia, Vincent, Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Vickers, Anthony M., xxxxxx.
Vigelis, Eugene R., xxxxxxxx.
Vinci, Joseph F., xxxxxx.
Volponi, Anthony A., xxxxxx.
Von Kiparski, Hans, xxxxxxxx.
Wacloff, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Waddell, Ralph L., xxxxxx.
Waghelstein, John D., xxxxxx.
Wagner, Fred L., xxxxxx.
Waldhour, Louis G., xxxxxx.
Waldrop, William R., xxxxxx.
Walker, Byron G., xxxxxxxx.
Walker, Frederick A., xxxxxxxx.
Walker, James M., xxxxxx.
Walker, Philip A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Walkup, Larry R., xxxxxx.
Wallace, Richard B., xxxxxx.
Wallace, Woodrow W., xxxxxx.
Waller, Calvin A. H., xxxxxx.
Walsh, Daniel P., xxxxxx.
Walsh, Thomas A., xxxxxx.
Ward, Jerido, xxxxxx.
Ward, Joseph G., II, xxxxxxxx.
Ward, Olin S., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Ware, William M., xxxxxx.
Warren, James A., xxxxxxxx.
Washington, Charles, xxxxxx.
Waters, Russell A., xxxxxx.
Watkins, Charlie C., xxxxxx.
Watkins, John A., xxxxxxxx.
Watson, Henry C., III, xxxxxx.
Watts, Pitt M., III, xxxxxx.
Weaver, Charles R., xxxxxx.
Weaver, James H., xxxxxx.
Webb, Gerald E., xxxxxx.
Webb, James M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Webster, Carl S., xxxxxx.
Webster, Grady F., xxxxxx.
Weening, Otto, xxxxxx.
Weinhold, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Weir, David E., xxxxxx.
Welch, Jerry F., xxxxxx.
Welch, Michael N., xxxxxx.
Wells, Herbert D., xxxxxx.
Wendt, Robert L., xxxxxxxx.
Wente, David O., xxxxxxxx.
Wesneski, Carl A., xxxxxx.
Westmoreland, Verlon E., xxxxxx.
Whaley, Max, xxxxxx.
Whatley, David T., xxxxxx.
White, Donald R., xxxxxx.
White, Harry N., xxxxxx.
White, James M., xxxxxx.
White, Jerry A., xxxxxx.
White, Jerry D., xxxxxx.
White, Walter S., Jr., xxxx
Whitehead, Floyd D., xxxxxx.
Whitlaw, Nathaniel, xxxxxx.
Whitley, Wade H., II, xxxxxx.
Whitworth, David C., xxxxxx.
Wicker, Rush R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Wicksell, Harry H., xxxxxx.
Wilder, William B., xxxxxx.
Wiley, Noble J., III., xxxxxx.
Wilhelm, Robert S., xxxxxx.
Wilkes, John S., III., xxxxxx.
Wilkie, David G., xxxxxx.
Willauer, John H., xxxxxx.
Willey, Frank G., Jr., xxxxxx.
Williams, Cary E., xxxxxx.
Williams, Charles R., xxxxxxxx.
Williams, David K., xxxxxx.
Williams, Donnie H., xxxxxxxx.
Williams, Frank K., xxxxxxxx.
Williams, John S., xxxxxx.
Williams, Lonnie B., xxxxxx.
Williams, Michael K., xxxxxx.
Williams, Paul E., xxxxxx.
Willis, Jerry T., xxxxxx.
Willison, Darryl L., xxxxxxxx.
Willoughby, William, xxxxxx.
Wilson, Bruce E., xxxxxx.
Wilson, Daniel H., xxxxxx.
Wilson, David G., xxxxxxxx.
Wilson, Gene R., xxxxxx.
Wilson, John H., xxxxxx.
Wilson, Walter K., xxxxxx.
Windsor, Humphrey F., xxxxxx.
Winfree, Wesley C., xxxxxxxx.
Wisby, James M., xxxxxx.
Witcher, Robert A., xxxxxx.
Witherspoon, Jerry, xxxxxx.
Wolton, John B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Wolff, James W., xxxxxx.
Wollmering, Lawrence E., xxxxxx.
Wolpert, Robert A., xxxxxx.
Wolstenholme, Donald E., xxxxxx.
Wood, Anthony B., xxxxxx.
Wood, John W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Wood, William A., xxxxxx.
Woodbeck, Charles A., xxxxxx.
Woods, Lawrence D., xxxxxx.
Worlund, Shyron L., xxxxxx.
Wright, Jackie V., xxxxxx.
Wright, Jerry T., xxxxxx.
Wright, Raymond J., xxxxxxxx.
Wrockloff, George E., xxxxxx.
Yamaguchi, Phillip, xxxxxx.
Yeagley, John P., xxxxxx.
Yeomans, William A., xxxxxx.
Yeosock, John J., xxxxxx.
Yersky, Ronald E., xxxxxx.
Yetman, Robert R., xxxxxx.
York, Dennis J., xxxxxx.
York, Donald, xxxxxx.
York, James J., xxxxxx.
Zebarth, Roger L., xxxxxx.
Zingle, Paul R., xxxxxx.
Zoller, Harvey F., xxxxxx.
Zook, Neil J., xxxxxxxx.
Zorn, Burl A., xxxx

To be captains, Chaplain

Bezanson, Ronald S., xxxxxxxx.
Heim, Richard L., xxxx

Johnson, Paul E., xxxxxxxx.
Martin, Richard K., xxxxxxxx.
Piskura, Joseph H., xxxxxxxx.
Woehr, David J., xxxxxxxx.

To be captains, Women's Army Corps

Albright, Barbara L., xxxx.
Ball, Elizabeth C., xxxx.
Burbank, Arlene G., xxxx.
Cascone, Joan C., xxxx.
Klainer, Joyce I., xxxx.
McCord, Patricia A., xxxx.
Slater, Suzanne, xxxx.
Tilden, Carol J., xxxx.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Anderson, James R., xxxxxxxx.
Bigelow, Charles R., xxxxxxxx.
Bilbrey, Gordon L., xxxxxxxx.
Bingham, Korth E., xxxxxxxx.
Blalock, James C., Sr., xxxxxxxx.
Bobitt, John R., xxxxxxxx.
Bogart, John N., xxxxxxxx.
Bowe, Richard G., xxxxxxxx.
Brazinsky, John H., xxxxxxxx.
Brobeck, Alan, xxxxxxxx.
Buhrow, William L., xxxxxxxx.
Cipriano, Frank J., xxxxxxxx.
Clark, Robert W., xxxxxxxx.
Coats, David A., xxxxxxxx.
Cobb, Tyson C., xxxxxxxx.
Conroy, Robert W., xxxxxxxx.
Davis, William R., xxxxxxxx.
Dawson, John T., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Demtrak, Christofer S., xxxxxxxx.
Evans, Roger W., xxxxxxxx.
Feldman, Melvin L., xxxxxxxx.
Firestone, Marvin H., xxxxxxxx.
Fossum, Dale R., xxxxxxxx.
Geschke, Dietrich W., xxxxxxxx.
Glasser, Stephen P., xxxxxxxx.
Greer, Thomas D., xxxxxxxx.
Gunther, Robert C., xxxxxxxx.
Hall, Ronald R., xxxxxxxx.
Hallee, Theodore J., xxxxxxxx.
Hecht, Manfred H., xxxxxxxx.
Hill, John C., xxxxxxxx.
Hinckley, Marshall, xxxxxxxx.
Hooper, Robert L., xxxxxxxx.
Irby, Benjamin F., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
James, Charles F., xxxxxxxx.
Kimball, James D., xxxxxxxx.
Kowalski, Leonard R., xxxxxxxx.
Lane, Charles D., xxxxxxxx.
Lefko, Andrew G., xxxxxxxx.
Light, Jimmy A., xxxxxxxx.
Lung, John A., xxxxxxxx.
MacDonald, Robert, xxxxxxxx.
Marrin, Daniel J., xxxxxxxx.
McAninch, Jack W., xxxxxxxx.
Morrisseau, Paul M., xxxxxxxx.
Neel, Donald R., xxxxxxxx.
Nevarez, Leonard J., xxxxxxxx.
Powell, George K., xxxxxxxx.
Rapp, Robert S., xxxxxxxx.
Renn, John S., III, xxxxxxxx.
Rodriguez-Garces, Francisco, xxxxxxxx.
Ruark, Sylvan R., xxxxxxxx.
Sabol, Edward D., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Shaw, Jon A., xxxxxxxx.
Smith, Alvin E., xxxxxxxx.
Smith, Carl R., xxxxxxxx.
Smith, Donald W., xxxxxxxx.
Smith, Gerald E., xxxxxxxx.
Stephens, Robert O., xxxxxxxx.
Strait, Gail B., xxxxxxxx.
Taylor, Robert R., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Thomason, William B., xxxxxxxx.
Travis, Richard T., xxxxxxxx.
Wagner, Kenneth J., xxxxxxxx.
Wearn, Joseph H., xxxxxxxx.
Welch, Melton J., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Wheeling, James R., xxxxxxxx.
Williams, Reginald, xxxxxxxx.
Williams, Troy H., xxxxxxxx.
Zindel, Barry L., xxxxxxxx.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Alexander, Bassell, xxxxxxxx.
Dean, Richard J., xxxxxxxx.
Dowdy, Thomas S., xxxxxxxx.
Spano, Donald M., xxxxxxxx.
Ward, James P., xxxxxxxx.
Zehngraff, Paul E., xxxxxxxx.

To be captains, Veterinary Corps

Fairchild, David G., xxxxxxxx.
Fruin, John T., xxxxxxxx.
Shroyer, Emerson L., xxxxxxxx.
Sims, James E., xxxxxxxx.
Taylor, James F., xxxxxxxx.
Vandercook, Richard, xxxxxxxx.

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Baker, George D., xxxxxx.
Baker, Harlan H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Barnes, Perry A., xxxxxx.
Barnes, Walter, Jr., xxxxxx.
Belcher, David R., xxxxxx.
Bell, John H., xxxxxxxx.
Bennett, Winston R., xxxxxx.
Black, Baxter F., III, xxxxxx.
Braddock, Thomas E., xxxxxx.
Brown, Wallace J., xxxxxx.
Burn, Joseph J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Carlson, Carl E., xxxxxx.
Carnahan, Robert P., xxxxxx.
Coleman, Jerry B., xxxxxx.
Creighton, James P., xxxxxxx.
Danhouser, David C., xxxx.
De Los Santos, Carlos, Jr., xxxxxx.
Delane, Charles E., xxxxxx.
Derrickson, William, xxxxxx.
Dixon, Richard N., xxxxxx.
Dominguez, Roberto, xxxxxxxx.
Donehew, Gerald R., xxxxxx.
Ellingson, Mayo K., xxxxxx.
Elsarelli, Leon E., xxxx.
Evans, Harold L., xxxxxx.
Forrer, Dennis B., xxxxxx.
Frate, Joseph A., xxxxxx.
Fulton, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Goodman, Dorris C., xxxxxx.
Gorby, Richard J., xxxxxxx.
Graydon, Donald M., xxxxxx.
Greene, Frederick L., xxxxxx.
Greenhalgh, Donald, xxxxxx.
Grider, Donald A., xxxxxx.
Hahn, Ruediger, xxxxxx.
Hale, Arnold W., xxxxxx.
Hamilton, John C., xxxxxx.
Hansen, Louis J., xxxxxx.
Harris, Cecil B., xxxxxx.
Harris, Jon N., xxxxxx.
Heggers, John P., xxxxxx.
Heitzman, Lawrence, xxxxxx.
Herber, William E., xxxxxx.
Hill, Walter B., xxxxxx.
Holcomb, Robert E., xxxxxxxx.
Houston, William E., xxxxxx.
Howell, Lawrence C., xxxxxx.
Iber, Peter K., xxxxxxxx.
Jessen, Gary C., xxxxxx.
Jones, Ronald C., xxxxxx.
Kearns, William J., xxxxxx.
Keller, Thomas E., xxxxxx.
Kestner, James C., xxxxxxxx.
Lanier, Jack O., xxxxxx.
Lassiter, Charles S., xxxxxx.
Lingle, Kenneth C., xxxxxx.
Lynch, George R., xxxx.
Mallory, Lloyd M., xxxxxx.
Malone, Richard L., xxxxxxxx.
Marchand, Francis W., xxxxxx.
Marine, Wayne E., xxxxxx.
McCurley, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Meiers, Richard E., xxxxxx.
Mendell, James M., xxxxxx.
Merritt, Thomas E., xxxxxx.
Miller, Roger C., xxxxxx.
Osborne, Edward J., xxxxxx.
Peacock, James L., xxxxxx.
Pedersen, Edward R., xxxxxx.
Penick, Norman D., xxxxxx.
Phillips, Harry V., xxxxxx.
Plaatsman, James P., xxxxxx.
Pollock, Archie D., xxxxxx.
Powell, Larry G., xxxxxx.
Quillin, Robert M., xxxxxx.
Rasmusson, James A., xxxxxxxx.
Reuter, Leroy H., xxxxxx.
Roach, Roy S., xxxxxx.
Sandleback, Eugene, xxxxxx.
Schlaak, James R., xxxxxx.
Schwindt, Philip C., xxxxxxxx.
Shannon, Sam Jr., xxxxxx.
Sinnot, George W., xxxxxx.
Soles, Elmer M., xxxxxx.
Solomon, Richard C., xxxxxx.
Stone, Leland M., xxxxxx.
Summary, James J., xxxxxx.
Thompson, George E., xxxxxx.
Travis, Edward E., xxxxxx.
Trumbla, Thomas E., xxxxxx.
Turner, John W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Vallandingham, James W., xxxxxx.
Webb, Byron D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Wergeland, David A., xxxxxx.
Zell, Matthew N., xxxxxxxx.

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Christ, Nancy M., xxxxx.
Clifton, Mary R., xxxxx.
Condon, Kathleen T., xxxxx.
Dennis, Carmen R., xxxxx.
Garfall, Gloria M., xxxxx.
Glor, Beverly A. K., xxxxx.
Goodwin, Nancy C., xxxxx.
Heer, Edith J., xxxxx.
Hiers, Frances A., xxxxx.
Jims, Madeline P., xxxxx.
Kucha, Deloros H., xxxxx.
Mantooth, Jerry M., xxxxx.
Marsh, Carolyn J., xxxxx.
McCaffrey, Mary G., xxxxx.
McKenzie, Nancy J., xxxxx.
Nagelhout, Anna J., xxxxx.
Nolfe, Vera A., xxxxx.
Skinner, Fay J., xxxxx.
Sullivan, Barbara A., xxxxx.
Vineys, Eugenia A., xxxxx.

To be captains, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Boyd, Kattie A., xxxx.
Lucas, Mary E., xxxx.
Uemura, Norma M., xxxx.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate October 11, 1966:

The nomination sent to the Senate on September 26, 1966, of David K. Burkhart to be postmaster at Del Mar in the State of California.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God has not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind.—II Timothy 1: 7.

Eternal God, our Father, who art the refuge of Thy people in every age and our strength in this present hour—make Thyself real to us as we bow humbly in Thy presence. Help us to recognize our dependence upon Thee, our constant need of Thy strength, Thy guidance, and Thy love. Give us to know that Thou art always with us and that with Thee we can be made ready for every responsibility and equal to every experience.

We pray for peace in our world, for good will among our people and for a faith in Thee which makes us strong, gives us courage and helps us on our upward way.

May Thy spirit touch each one of us with healing power. Kindle our faith, make sensitive our consciences, dedicate