

respite to the Greeks. Their country was devastated, and they faced a new threat within their borders in the form of armed Communist guerrilla bands seeking to overthrow the government. However, once more they showed courageous determination to preserve their liberty at all costs. The struggle against the guerrillas was long. It delayed economic reconstruction by several years. But, finally, it too was crowned with success.

Americans can be proud that they played an important role in this new struggle. They have been gratified since that time to see a strong, stable government established in Greece and to observe the rapid progress of the Greek economy.

The ideal of democracy, born in ancient Greece over 2,000 years ago, has prevailed, and Greece today has taken her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

It is thus a pleasure and a privilege to extend greetings to the Greek people on the occasion of their Independence Day and to recall a century and a half of friendship between the people of America and the people of Greece.

Richard Neutra, Philosopher-Architect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1967

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, in my desire to honor Richard Neutra on the occasion of the celebration of his 75th birthday, it would be hard to find a more fitting and perceptive tribute to his genius and his contributions to mankind than the article written 1 year ago by Jill Chisholm of the Rand Daily Mail, Johannesburg, South Africa:

He is 74, with an unruly shock of white hair and curiously contrasting eyebrows, black and bushy.

He makes startling statements like: "The job of the architect is to keep the divorce rate down." Or: "The architect is a physiotherapist, he is treating you 24 hours a day, 365 days a year." Or again: "If I am to

design a cage for a polar bear, first I must learn to know the polar bear and then come to love the polar bear."

His mission in life is to save mankind from a cruel, lingering death in ugly buildings and traffic jams.

Possibly, by the turn of the century in this fast-contracting world, his maxim that "space is not to be measured with a yardstick" will be to architecture what Freud's sex theories were to psychology and Einstein's relativity to science. Both men were his friends and both have influenced his work.

His name is Richard Joseph Neutra and he is acknowledged as one of the world's greatest architects and town planners.

The article began with the introductory statement above and then went on to quote liberally from the philosopher-architect's own words:

We are plagued by specialization today—by people who know only their own small, special bits, he asserts.

The planner of the human setting—which is what an architect or town planner is—should not be a specialist, but a coordinator, a harmonist.

Not even the worst architect has designed a house which kills those who move into it, immediately. But because destruction is slower, it is not necessarily more agreeable.

Cumulative effects are the least suspect because they are the least noticeable—but they are no less dangerous.

Quoting again from Miss Chisholm:

On the other hand, an architect or town planner can act as a physiotherapist to modern man, subject as he is to so many strains and stresses.

To do so, says Mr. Neutra, he must draw on the advances made in the life sciences—right down to knowing "how a person goes to pieces, while looking for a parking place or being forced to make a left-hand turn instead of a right-hand turn."

Space is Mr. Neutra's other great "cause." In his views on space he is as much a pioneer today as he was 40 years ago when he pleaded for "modern" architecture in the United States and brought freeways to town planning, heliports to roof tops, and traffic-pedestrian "segregation" to shopping centers.

Mr. Neutra's basic premise is that even the largest, least populous of lands will one day face a space problem as the world community grows and grows.

However, "Man can lead a richer life in a smaller area than he thinks necessary," he says. "Space is not to be measured by a yardstick or figured in square feet, but by the richness of what one experiences in that space."

Richard Neutra's theories of planning and architecture are particularly rele-

vant in our own Los Angeles community where the challenge of providing a good human setting in limited space has frequently not been met.

His own designs, however, have been most faithful to his theories and have been recognized for their austere, functional lines and brilliant use of space. In his attempt to make the space he must work with "psychologically viable"; he has also utilized mirrors, water sun refraction, trees and shrubbery as his tools to fit his designs to the "human pattern."

Los Angeles contains many of the most famous Neutra "landmarks" as he has made his home in our community since 1922. These include his first major work, the Phillip Lovell Health House, built in 1927; the pioneering Neutra Research House built in 1932 on a plot of land only 60 by 70 feet; the Mariner's Medical Arts Building, which is designed to enhance tranquillity and privacy in the doctor-patient relationship; the Richard J. Neutra Elementary School, which emphasizes the holding of outdoor classes and, by doing away with partitions, the movement of students between classes; the auditorium of the Beverly Hills High School; and the new hall of records in the civic center. Presently under construction is a 13-story tower addition to the Garden Grove Church and the Department of Justice complex.

I am confident that many Los Angelenians join with me, on the occasion of his 75th birthday, in commending Richard Neutra on the consistency and quality of his designs over the years and the fact that they are as timely and as appropriate today as when he first conceived them. We might only regret that our sprawling city could not have more closely followed the patterns and theories of Richard Neutra. Summed up in his own words:

If all of Los Angeles had been built with the same space economy, then LA would be a third as large in area, a fraction of its presently paved area—of its power utility lines and of its telephone poles. There would be only a fraction of criss-crossing of commuting lanes and exhausting gases, and the sky would be as blue as when I arrived 45 years ago.

We wish Richard Neutra many more productive years and thank him for the significant effect he has had on the planning and environment of our community.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 3, 1967

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

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

O God, the might of them that put their trust in Thee, amid all the subtle dangers that beset us, save us from the fatal folly of attempting to rely upon our own strength.

In a world so uncertain about many things, we are sure of no light but Thine, no refuge but in Thee.

The din of words assails our ears from an agitated world. Grant us an inner calm undisturbed by any outer commotion. Give us courage to seek the truth honestly and reverence to follow humbly the kindly light that leads us on.

Thou hast created us to be Thy temples. Grant that the holy places of our inner lives may harbor nothing unworthy of our high calling in Thee:

"The ruins of our soul repair,
And make our heart a house of prayer."

In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and by unanimous consent, the

reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 23, 1967, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY— MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President, transmitting the annual report of the National Capital

Transportation Agency for the calendar year 1966, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:
I am pleased to transmit the second annual report of the National Capital Transportation Agency for calendar year 1966.

Significant steps were taken during 1966 by the Congress, the executive branch, and the State and local governments of the National Capital region toward solving the transportation problems of the Washington metropolitan area.

During the year evidence of progress first became visible to Washington commuters. Survey markers and boring equipment on streets and sidewalks show that we are finally beginning to move.

In October, the Congress approved the interstate compact between Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia creating the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. That authority will assume responsibility for the Washington rapid transit system and plan its extension into the Maryland and Virginia suburbs. At year's end, with the assistance of the experienced staff of the Transportation Agency, the new authority had already embarked upon the preparation of a regional mass transit plan.

Progress has been made. We have the authority to attack the severe traffic problems plaguing the Nation's Capital and its suburbs. Now we must, and will, make every effort to implement that authority—wisely, rapidly, and efficiently.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 3, 1967.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and by unanimous consent, the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Senator GORDON ALLOTT to attend the Petersburg Conference on Development Aid, to be held at Bonn, Germany, on April 4 to 7, 1967, in lieu of Senator FRANK CARLSON, resigned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON INVESTIGATION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF OLIVES INTO THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to Senate resolution, a report of that Commission's investigation with respect to the importation of olives into the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA

A letter from the president, and national executive director, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that organization, for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 32

"Whereas, The United States Supreme Court has ruled that membership in both houses of a bicameral state legislation must be apportioned only according to population; and

"Whereas, For 175 years the people of the various states have had the freedom to apportion their legislatures in the manner they felt best reflected the best interests of the people, recognizing that a system of apportionment that might be best for one state might not necessarily accommodate the needs of another state, but that each should be free to make its own selection; therefore, be it

"Resolved, By the House of Representatives of the Seventy-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that this Legislature respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a Constitutional Convention for the purpose of submitting a Constitutional Amendment to the States which will secure to the people the right of some choice in the method of apportionment of one house of a state legislature on a basis other than population alone; and be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution is rescinded if the Congress itself no later than June 30, 1967, proposes such a plan to the states for ratification; and, be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this Resolution be immediately transmitted by the Secretary of State to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States and to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States."

"Adopted by the House, March 2, 1967.

"Speaker of the House.

"FREDRIC B. SELIKE,

"Clerk of the House.

"Concurred in by the Senate, March 13, 1967.

"SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,

"President of the Senate.

"EDWARD E. FERNANDES,

"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE MEMORIAL 1

"Memorializing Congress to enact the Heller Plan, or any other appropriate plan, of federal-state revenue-sharing.

"Whereas, it has become increasingly apparent to the Missouri Senate that additional sources of tax revenue will ultimately have to be made available to the several states; and

"Whereas, the most significant source of public taxation, the income tax, has to a major degree been controlled and preempted by the Federal government; and

"Whereas, the noted economist, Walter W. Heller, has formulated a revenue-sharing plan which 'would distribute a specified portion of the Federal individual income tax to the states each year on a per capita basis, with next to no strings attached'; and

"Whereas, under the Heller Plan 'States whose tax efforts are below par or who cut their taxes in response to the Federal subsidy would be penalized by reduction in their allotments. States making a high fiscal effort or intensifying that effort would be rewarded with larger allotments'; now, therefore,

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Missouri that the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact the Heller revenue-sharing plan, or any other appropriate plan, in order to give fiscal help to the states; and

"Be it further resolved that a duly attested copy of this memorial be immediately transmitted by the Secretary of the Senate to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each member of the Congress from the State of Missouri, and to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States and the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate of the United States.

"[ATTEST]

"JOSEPH A. BAUER,

"Secretary of the Senate.

"JOHN W. JOYNT,

"President pro tempore of the Senate.

"THOMAS P. BOEFEBOU,

"President of the Senate.

"WILLIAM BAXTER HOURS,

"Majority Floor Leader."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 74

"Memorializing Congress to enact the Heller Plan or any other appropriate plan of federal-state revenue-sharing.

"Whereas, it has become increasingly apparent to the Missouri House of Representatives that additional sources of tax revenues will ultimately have to be made available to the several states; and

"Whereas, the most significant source of public taxation, the income tax, has to a major degree been controlled and preempted by the Federal government; and

"Whereas, the noted economist, Walter W. Heller, has formulated a revenue-sharing plan which 'would distribute a specified portion of the Federal individual income tax to the states each year on a per capita basis, with next to no strings attached'; and

"Whereas, under the Heller Plan 'States whose tax efforts are below par or who cut their taxes in response to the Federal subsidy would be penalized by reduction in their allotments. States making a high fiscal effort or intensifying that effort would be re-

warded with larger allotments', now, therefore

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri that the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact the Heller revenue-sharing plan, or any other appropriate plan, in order to give fiscal help to the states; and

"Be it further resolved that a duly attested copy of this memorial be immediately transmitted by the Chief Clerk of the House to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each member of the Congress from the State of Missouri, and to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate of the United States.

"[ATTEST]

"JAMES E. GODFREY,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"PATRICK J. HICKEY,

"Speaker pro tempore, House of Representatives.

"RICHARD J. RALBERT,

"Majority Floor Leader, House of Representatives.

"AGNES MOORE,

"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newport, Ky., relating to daylight savings time; to the Committee on Commerce.

A petition signed by G. W. Brown, and sundry other citizens of Smyrna Beach, Fla., favoring an increase in social security; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the National Committee for Plebiscite, of Puerto Rico, in the United States, relating to the final status of the Island of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A petition issued by the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, of New York, N.Y., signed by Philip Ruby, and sundry other persons, favoring the enactment of a 10-year statute of limitations on deportation and denaturalization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION BY OHIO VALLEY IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Ohio Valley Improvement Association at a meeting of its board of directors on March 8 adopted a resolution in support of the Federal Water Quality Control Act of 1965 and suggesting certain additional legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

OVIA registers its support of the objectives of the Federal Water Quality Control Act of 1965 to enhance water quality in our streams and rivers for agriculture, aquatic life, recreation and water supply during an era of increasing population and expanding industry.

As an incentive to enable industry to move rapidly in the development and installation of water pollution control facilities, adequate to meet stream quality criteria suitable for the needs for rising populations and increasing industrial concentration, the OVIA recommends that Congress enact legislation to provide:

1. A substantial increase in the existing 7% Federal Income Tax investment credit for water pollution control facilities and more liberal provisions for accelerated depreciation of such facilities.

2. Federal grants in aid to properly incorporated industrial sewer districts.

In addition, it is recommended that the states provide exemption from sales and use taxes and from property taxes with respect to properly approved water pollution control facilities.

HARRY M. MACK, Chairman.

GEORGE J. KUEHNLE, Jr., President.

KENNETH M. LLOYD, Secretary.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TO FILE REPORT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations have until midnight tonight to file a report on a joint resolution.

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

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. 343. A bill to provide that the Federal office building to be constructed in Detroit, Mich., shall be named the "Patrick V. McNamara Federal Office Building" in memory of the late Patrick V. McNamara, a U.S. Senator from the State of Michigan from 1955 to 1966 (Rept. No. 82).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 1039. A bill to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 81).

By Mr. MOSS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 25. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Great Salt Lake National Monument, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 84).

LATIN AMERICAN SUMMIT CONFERENCE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 83)

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original joint resolution (S.J. Res. 60) to welcome the Latin American summit conference, and for other purposes, and submitted a report thereon, which joint resolution was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar, and the report ordered to be printed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1386. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that the special rule for determining the acquisition price of property damaged by subsidence of coal mines shall extend also to property damaged by subsidence of other mines; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FANNIN:

S. 1387. A bill to amend chapter 61 of title 18, United States Code, relating to lot-

teries to exempt deer hunting contests; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1388. A bill to provide annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund for certain widows and widowers by reducing the required period of marriage; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1389. A bill to amend the act of August 28, 1950, enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish, upon a reimbursable basis, certain inspection services involving overtime work; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 1390. A bill to establish a procedure whereby all candidates for elective Federal office may receive financial assistance from the Treasury to assist in defraying their election campaign expenses, and to repeal the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 1391. A bill to cancel certain construction costs and irrigation assessments chargeable against lands of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKE:

S. 1392. A bill for the relief of Mr. Chao Chun-Ling; and

S. 1393. A bill for the relief of Mr. Sun A-Chuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1394. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jorge Santiago Vidal Santiago; and

S. 1395. A bill for the relief of Dr. Brandia Don (nee Praschnik); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1396. A bill for the relief of Dr. Elvira Rey-Chilla;

S. 1397. A bill for the relief of Dr. Moises Mitrani; and

S. 1398. A bill for the relief of Irma Stefani Ruiz-Montalvo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 1399. A bill to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 1400. A bill to improve the statistics of the United States by providing for a census in the years 1968, 1975, and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1401. A bill to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. GRIFFIN (by request):

S. 1402. A bill for the relief of Leigh Products, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 1403. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving

benefits under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1404. A bill for the relief of Nasralla Aziz Barber (also known as Badry Barbar); and

S. 1405. A bill for the relief of Dr. Fernando B. Toledo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEARSON:

S. 1406. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jorge Mestas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. SMATHERS (for Mr. LONG of Louisiana):

S. 1407. A bill to amend the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966 so as to provide safeguards for the proper use of moneys paid to political parties from the presidential election campaign fund and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. PEARSON:

S.J. Res. 59. Joint resolution to authorize the incorporation of the U.S. Track and Field Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. PEARSON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S.J. Res. 60. Joint resolution to welcome the Latin American summit conference, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

(See reference to the above joint resolution when reported by Mr. FULBRIGHT, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself, Mr. MONROE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. FONG, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. MORTON, Mr. PEARSON, and Mr. CARLSON):

S.J. Res. 61. Joint resolution in honor of Amelia Earhart and Joan Merriam Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A REPORT BY SENATOR ELLENDER ENTITLED "A REVIEW OF U.S. GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS IN LATIN AMERICA"

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 100); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 100

Resolved, That there be printed with illustrations as a Senate document, a report entitled "A Review of United States Government Operations in Latin America," submitted by Senator Allen J. Ellender to the Senate Committee on Appropriations on March 22, 1967; and that nineteen hundred additional copies of such document be printed for the use of that committee.

TO PRINT THE APPENDIX TO THE REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S CABINET COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL STAFF RETIREMENT SYSTEMS AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. MONROE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 101); which

was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 101

Resolved, That the appendix to the report to the President by the Cabinet Committee on Federal Staff Retirement Systems entitled "Federal Staff Retirement Systems," be printed with illustrations as a Senate document, and that there be printed one thousand four hundred additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

TO AUTHORIZE PRINTING FOR THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF ITS REPORT ENTITLED "DEVELOPMENTS IN AGING—1966"

Mr. SMATHERS (for Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 102); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 102

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Special Committee on Aging five thousand five hundred additional copies of its report to the Senate, of the present Congress, entitled "Developments in Aging—1966."

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO CANDIDATES FOR ELECTIVE OFFICE

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a procedure whereby all candidates for elective office may receive financial assistance from the Treasury in defraying election expenses.

There have always been two mutually frustrating aspects of the campaign financing problem. On one hand, there has been the growing and apparently insoluble need for money; and, on the other hand, there has been constant concern and pressure to reduce the disproportionate, and frequently the improper influence of wealthy individuals and well-heeled special interests.

As population growth and costly new media compel candidates to seek ever larger amounts of money, the concern and pressure for reform increase.

Yet most of the reforms that have been proposed threaten, on balance, to reduce rather than increase the availability of funds for campaigning; and it is difficult for practical men to contemplate putting effective controls on some of the more doubtful practices in this field unless they can be assured that such controls will not further disrupt the political process.

Until lately, the reform packages that were offered seemed to many to threaten precisely such disruption. The only parts of these packages directed at bringing new money into the process were those offering tax incentives for political contributions; but there has been little reason to believe that such incentives would substantially increase the flow of political contributions. Those of our citizens who can least afford to make contributions would be least aided by having them made deductible. Those who can most afford to make contributions are least likely to be encouraged by deductions allowed only to the limit

of \$100. To allow deductibility for larger amounts would increase, rather than decrease, the proportionate influence of the wealthy. Outright tax credits for small contributions have been opposed as too cumbersome to administer and as subject to fraudulent abuse.

I personally believe it might be worth while at least to try either tax deductions or tax credits, but neither the Treasury Department nor the Congress seems disposed in this direction.

It was in light of this situation that last year the distinguished chairman of our committee proposed, and the Congress enacted, a bill embodying a novel and creative approach to the problem. It was an attempt to cut the Gordian knot of campaign financing through provision of what are, in effect, Government funds.

There was very little congressional debate and even less public attention paid at the time this bill was passed. But exceptions were taken then, and there have been a growing number and volume of objections raised since. Many of us who voted for the measure had reservations. The distinguished and creative Senator from Louisiana himself has acknowledged some and proposes to offer amendments. And it seems quite clear that if allowed to become operative as it stands, the law will provoke an ever-rising storm of criticism and opposition.

But it is important to note before we go any further than most of the opposition is not to the idea of Government funds per se. It is to the formula by which the funds would be distributed.

This is a vital distinction and it offers the clearest possible indication of where the solution lies. For if the problem is only in the formula, it should be possible to correct that formula without depriving the electoral process of a disinterested source of badly needed funds.

I believe many of the objections to the formula in the present law are valid.

First, its relief is applied to presidential campaigns rather than to congressional campaigns. While it is true that enormously greater sums are needed in presidential elections than in congressional, it is equally true, and more to the point, that the availability of funds for House and Senate elections is far less in proportion to the need than it is in presidential elections. Also, because of the greater multiplicity and diversity of presidential campaign fund sources, presidential candidates need far less protection against influence by any single special interest group than do candidates for the House and Senate.

Second, the transfer of very large sums of money from the Government to the headquarters organizations of the national parties would gravely restructure power within the parties. It is this prospect that gives the most color of justification to the "slush fund" accusations. Power would tend to flow with the money, from the top downward in the parties, rather than from the bottom upward as at present. There would be inhibition of diversity and independence, a drying up of the individual and local initiative that are the genius of our system, and a possibility on a national scale of the kind of

bossism now found only in certain big cities.

Third, by determining the funds to be disbursed in one election on the basis of the votes received in the preceding election, the law would impress the dead hand of the past upon the present. This would introduce an unnecessary and undesirable element of rigidity into our traditionally flexible system. As great as my own Democratic Party has been and is today, and as great as I am confident it will be in the future, I am unwilling to assure that it will live forever. And I am even more unwilling to give such assurance to the Republican Party. These are matters which future generations of Americans should decide for themselves, and this generation should not tie their hands.

Fourth, as presently written the law effectively eliminates all third parties as beneficiaries of the fund and from participation in the supervising agency. Even the proposed scaling down of the required vote total, and a provision for reimbursement based upon the election in which the expenditures are made, would eliminate some third parties and impose upon the others standards and procedures different from those for the major parties. This is objectionable and could prove dangerous. If the Republicans nominate whom I suspect they will nominate in 1968, many would not be averse to seeing a Bull Moose movement develop, and we should not put any obstacles in its way. My Republican friends should be equally mindful of the fragmentation propensities of the Democratic Party.

Fifth, and most serious in my judgment, is the fact that this formula, and indeed any formula, is an arbitrary proscription by the government of the political behavior of its citizens. The argument has been made that citizens may make a free choice as to whether to vote "ja" or "nein." The totalitarian choice is between helping or not helping only one party. Ours, in effect, would be between helping or not helping only two parties. In both cases, the people's vote is confined to alternatives posed by the government, rather than to alternatives the people themselves may want.

The distinction between democracy and totalitarianism is not solely that we believe each citizen should have one vote and that each vote should be equally weighted. The other side can profess to believe that, too. The true distinction is that we also believe that all citizens should have an equal right to political initiative and political action.

Traditionally, the role of Government with respect to the political process in America has been to assure that this was, in fact, the case. The laws regulating parties and political activity are primarily aimed at protecting the rights of individuals with respect to the process. The laws do not tell people what to do. They establish rules under which the people may do what they want.

Giving political money is a most important form of political action. For the government to decide to whom that money is to be given, and in what proportion, would be a major proscription of the political rights of the people. And I

submit that men and women in our profession should be the first to understand that for government to proscribe the political behavior of its citizens to whatever degree would be a much more fundamental and dangerous erosion of their liberty than almost any proscription of their economic behavior.

The Senator from Louisiana is absolutely right in asserting that the problem of campaign financing is reaching proportions that threaten a breakdown of our electoral system. He is right in maintaining that the integrity of the system requires an assured source of untainted money for campaign purposes. And I believe he is right in suggesting that the best and most available source would be our tax revenues.

The question is how can this be accomplished without the imposition of a disbursement formula that does violence to our principles and the rights of our citizens.

I believe there is a very simple answer to this question and that is to adapt the present legislation so as to let the people do the deciding and the giving.

My bill would accomplish this while retaining the two innovations in the legislation authored by the chairman of our committee: the use of tax revenues and the individual checkoff. And in leaving the initiative and the action with the people, it meets all of the objections raised against the present law, except the one against using tax money at all, while preserving its essential features. It also provides for contributions to candidates for Congress as well as to candidates for President.

The bill would operate as follows: All taxpayers who had checked the box on their income tax forms would receive political campaign contribution vouchers from the Treasury. These vouchers would be mailed to everyone at the same time, at the beginning of each campaign. In all years in which general elections are held for the House and Senate, there would be one voucher for such campaigns. In years in which there is also a presidential election, there would be an additional voucher for presidential campaigns.

Each voucher would be redeemable for \$1 when presented to the Treasury Department at times and places to be prescribed, but only when presented by authorized candidates and political committees. The vouchers would have no value for anyone else, or for any taxpayer who neglected or decided not to use his. In each election year, the Congress could appropriate sufficient funds to cover the number of vouchers requested, and the amounts not redeemed in that campaign would revert to the Treasury at the end of the year.

The bill also provides for separate reporting of expenditures under this program and for the return to the Treasury of unexpended amounts.

This system would be almost automatic in its operation. It would have the virtue that while the taxpayer would request his voucher early in the year, he would not have to use it before learning who are the candidates and what are the issues. It would do least violence to existing or future political institutions or practices. In fact, no candidate or po-

litical committee that I know of would be hurt in any way, and almost all would benefit.

Indeed, the entire political process would benefit, not only from the infusion of much needed and untainted money, but also from the stimulus to grass roots activity of widespread participation in political financing.

Mr. President, I hope the committee will hold hearings on my bill and similar proposals.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1390) to establish a procedure whereby all candidates for elective Federal office may receive financial assistance from the Treasury to assist in defraying their election campaign expenses, and to repeal the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966; introduced by Mr. METCALF, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1390

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Federal Elections Campaign Financing Act of 1967".

AMENDMENT TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

SEC. 2. (a) Part VIII of subchapter A of chapter 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"PART VIII—VOUCHERS REDEEMABLE FOR FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN EXPENSES

"Sec. 6096. Furnishing of vouchers to taxpayers.

"SEC. 6096. FURNISHING OF VOUCHERS TO TAXPAYERS.

"(a) CONGRESSIONAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN VOUCHERS.—Every individual (other than a nonresident alien) whose income tax liability for his taxable year preceding a congressional election year is \$1 or more may elect to receive congressional election campaign voucher which shall be redeemable as provided in section 3 of the Federal Elections Campaign Financing Act of 1967.

"(b) PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN VOUCHERS.—Every individual (other than a nonresident alien) whose income tax liability for his taxable year preceding a presidential election year is \$1 or more (\$2 or more, if the taxpayer also makes an election under subsection (a) for such taxable year) may elect to receive a presidential election campaign voucher which shall be redeemable as provided in section 3 of the Federal Elections Campaign Financing Act of 1967.

"(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) CONGRESSIONAL ELECTION YEAR.—The term 'congressional election year' means a calendar year in which a general election is held in the various States for the election of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.

"(2) PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION YEAR.—The term 'presidential election year' means a calendar year in which a general election is held in the various States and the District of Columbia for the election of presidential and vice presidential electors.

"(3) INCOME TAX LIABILITY.—The income tax liability of an individual for any taxable

year is the amount of the tax imposed by chapter 1 on such individual for such taxable year (as shown on his return), reduced by the sum of the credits (as shown on his return) allowable under sections 32(2), 33, 35, 37, and 38.

"(4) **TAXABLE YEAR TO WHICH APPLICABLE.**—An individual's taxable year preceding a congressional election year or presidential election year is his last taxable year which ends before April 1 of such congressional election year or such presidential election year, as the case may be.

"(d) **MANNER AND TIME OF ELECTIONS.**—An election under subsection (a) or (b) may be made for any taxable year preceding a congressional election year or presidential election year, as the case may be, in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate may prescribe by regulations—

"(1) at the time of filing the return of the tax imposed by chapter 1 for such taxable year, or

"(2) at any other time after the time of filing such return and before such date as the Secretary or his delegate may prescribe by regulations.

"(e) **FURNISHING OF VOUCHERS.**—The Secretary or his delegate shall issue and furnish—

"(1) a congressional election campaign voucher to each individual who makes an election under subsection (a) for any taxable year, and

"(2) a presidential election campaign voucher to each individual who makes an election under subsection (b) for any taxable year.

Such vouchers shall be in such form as the Secretary or his delegate may prescribe and shall be issued and furnished after August 15 and before October 1 of the congressional election year or presidential election year, as the case may be."

(b) The table of parts for subchapter A of chapter 61 of such Code is amended by striking out the item relating to part VIII and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Part VIII. Vouchers redeemable for Federal election campaign expenses."

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to income tax liability for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1966.

TRANSFER AND REDEMPTION OF VOUCHERS

SEC. 3. (a) An individual who has been furnished a congressional election campaign voucher under section 6096 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 may transfer such voucher, without consideration, to (A) any qualified candidate for election to the Senate or the House of Representatives of the United States or (B) any qualified committee designated by any such qualified candidate.

(b) An individual who has been furnished a presidential election campaign voucher under section 6096 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 may transfer such voucher, without consideration, to (A) any qualified candidate for election to the office of President or Vice President of the United States or (B) any qualified committee designated by any such qualified candidate.

(c) A qualified candidate or qualified committee to which a congressional election campaign voucher or presidential election campaign voucher, as the case may be, is transferred under subsection (a) or (b) may, subject to the provisions of subsection (d), present such voucher to the Secretary of the Treasury for redemption. The Secretary shall pay to such qualified candidate or qualified committee \$1 for each voucher so presented for redemption.

(d) A congressional election campaign voucher or presidential election campaign voucher may be redeemed under subsection (c) only if it is presented for redemption—

(1) on or after September 1 and on or be-

fore November 30 of the year in which it is issued, and

(2) at such time and place as the Secretary of the Treasury prescribes by regulations.

(e) For purposes of this section—

(1) The term "qualified candidate" means—

(A) with respect to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, an individual who has met all requirements established by the laws of the State from which he seeks election to qualify as a candidate for election to the Senate or the House of Representatives of the United States, respectively, and

(B) with respect to the offices of President and Vice President of the United States, an individual who has met all the requirements established by the laws of any State to qualify as a candidate in such State for election to the office of President or Vice President of the United States, respectively.

(2) The term "qualified committee" means a committee or other organization (including National, State, and local committees of a political party) which has been designated in writing to the Secretary of the Treasury by a qualified candidate, or by two or more qualified candidates, as a committee which such candidate or candidates have authorized to make expenditures on behalf of his or their candidacy or to redeem vouchers under subsection (c) of this section.

(f) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out his duties under this section.

USE OF FUNDS: REPAYMENT OF UNUSED FUNDS

SEC. 4. (a) The moneys received by a qualified candidate under section 3 may be used by him only to defray expenses incurred by him in carrying on his campaign for election to the office for which he is a candidate. The moneys received by a qualified committee under section 3 may be used by it only to defray expenses incurred by it in carrying on its campaign on behalf of the candidate or candidates who designated it as a qualified committee for purposes of section 3(e) (2).

(b) Each qualified candidate and each qualified committee which receives moneys under section 3 shall, to the extent such moneys are not used as prescribed in subsection (a), repay such moneys to the Secretary of the Treasury. Such repayment shall be made as soon as practicable and, in any event, not later than December 31 of the year in which such moneys are received.

REPORTS TO COMPTROLLER GENERAL; AUDITS; REPAYMENTS

SEC. 5. (a) Each qualified candidate and each qualified committee which redeems congressional election campaign vouchers or presidential election campaign vouchers under section 3 shall, on or before December 31 of the year of redemption, render a true and accurate report to the Comptroller General of the United States of the use of the moneys paid to them under such section and not repaid to the Secretary of the Treasury under section 4(b). The report required under this subsection by a qualified committee shall be made by the treasurer of such committee.

(b) The Comptroller General may conduct such audits and examinations as he deems necessary with respect to the reports received by him under subsection (a). In conducting any such audit or examination of any such report the Comptroller General shall have the right to examine any pertinent books and records of the qualified candidate or qualified committee making such report. Each such candidate and each such committee shall furnish to the Comptroller General such books, records, and other information as he may request. If as a result of any such audit or examination, the Comptroller General determines that any amount of the

moneys received by such qualified candidate or qualified committee under section 3 and not repaid under section 4(b) was not used for the purposes prescribed by section 4(a), he shall so notify such candidate or such committee and such candidate or such committee shall repay such amount to the Secretary of the Treasury.

(c) No report shall be required under subsection (a) by any qualified candidate or qualified committee which has repaid to the Secretary of the Treasury all of the moneys received by such candidate or such committee under section 3.

(d) The Comptroller General is authorized to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out his duties under this section.

COORDINATION WITH CORRUPT PRACTICES ACT

SEC. 6. (a) For purposes of applying the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925 (2 U.S.C. 241-256), moneys received under section 3 of this Act shall not be considered to be contributions. For purposes of applying section 309 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 248), expenditures made by a candidate which are defrayed out of moneys received by him under section 3 of this Act shall not be taken into account.

(b) For purposes of applying section 609 of title 18, United States Code, moneys received under section 3 of this Act by a qualified committee which is a political committee (as defined for purposes of such section 609) shall not be considered to be contributions, and expenditures made by any such committee which are defrayed out of moneys received by it under section 3 of this Act shall not be taken into account.

CRIMINAL PENALTIES

SEC. 7. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person—

(1) to sell, or offer to sell, or to purchase, or to offer to purchase, any congressional election campaign voucher or any presidential election campaign voucher issued under section 6096 of the Internal Revenue Code 1954;

(2) to use any moneys paid by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 3 of this Act for any purpose other than the purposes prescribed by section 4(a) of this Act;

(3) to fail to make any report to the Comptroller General of the United States required by section 5(a) of this Act to be so made;

(4) to make a false, fictitious, or fraudulent report to the Comptroller General of the United States under section 5(a) of this Act, or to include in any such report any misrepresentation of a material fact;

(5) to fail to furnish to the Comptroller General of the United States any books, records, or information required by section 5(b) of this Act to be so furnished;

(6) to falsify any book, record, or other information furnished to the Comptroller General of the United States under section 5(b) of this Act; or

(7) to fail to pay to the Secretary of the Treasury any amounts required to be paid by section 4(b) or under section 5(b) of this Act.

(b) Any person who knowingly and willfully violates any provision of subsection (a) shall be fined not more than \$5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 8. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

REPEAL OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND ACT OF 1966

SEC. 9. The Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966 (title III of the Act of November 13, 1966, Public Law 89-809) is repealed.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I introduce the bill at this time because I wish to announce that in the event that there is an attempt in connection with H.R. 6950 to discuss the matter of campaign contributions and tax credits I shall submit the bill I am introducing today as an amendment to H.R. 6950.

AMEND SECTION 7701 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my able and distinguished senior colleague the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to require the collector of internal revenue to treat professional service corporations as corporations for Federal income tax purposes. The proposed legislation would reverse the Treasury regulations which today prohibit these professional corporations and professional associations from being taxed like other corporations and associations.

Ever since the 1935 Supreme Court decision in the case of *Morrisey* against Commissioner, associations which had the attributes of a corporation have been taxed like a corporation. These attributes include limited liability, unlimited life, centralized management, and a profit motive. In *Pelton* against Commissioner, decided by the seventh circuit in 1936, *United States* against *Kinter*, decided by the ninth circuit in 1954, and in other cases, associations of professional people specifically were treated as corporations for tax purposes. Despite the great body of law that has built up regarding the tax status of these associations, in 1965 the Treasury issued regulations which reversed these court decisions even though there is no act of Congress to support them.

The Treasury regulations have a single objective. They are designed to prevent professional people from gaining the benefits of private pension plans. Treasury has always opposed professional people having private pension plans. They began objecting soon after Congress amended the tax law in 1942 to encourage the formation of pension plans. They have never ceased.

It took Congress 15 years to override the objections of the Treasury and enact, in 1962, a meager program to enable self-employed persons to establish tax-deductible pension programs for themselves and their employees. The tax benefits provided for professional people under this act are so meager that very few self-employed persons have actually set up retirement plans under the new law. Until last year's amendments to the Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act enlarging the tax deduction became effective in 1968, this act must be viewed as virtually useless.

Because of the shortcomings of the 1962 act, self-employed groups all over the country appealed to their State legislatures to amend local laws so that professional people could form associations or incorporate, become employees of their own corporations for the purpose of practicing their professions, and participate in a tax-sheltered pension plan

in precisely the same manner as owner-managers of ordinary corporations are permitted to do. The States responded, and today, between 30 and 40 of them have laws which authorize professional people to organize a corporation or association for the practice of their profession. However, because of the 1965 Treasury regulation, the tax collector ignores these State laws and continues to deny corporation tax treatment to these professional groups organized under them.

The American Bar Association, in commenting on these Treasury regulations in March of 1964 stated:

These proposed regulations discriminate between professionals and others; they are contrary to the cases and inconsistent with the 1960 regulations, as well as with themselves. They are unsupported by any authority. They will present an Internal Revenue Service with immense difficulties of administration. They create irrebuttable presumptions of fact, which as long ago as *Heiner v. Donnan*, 285 U.S. 312 (1932) were outlawed. They appear to be merely an attempt to validate preconceived notions as to the proper classification of professional associations and corporations for tax purposes.

The bar association concludes that these regulations are so arbitrary and unsupported by authority that they would result in extensive litigation.

Congress should not sit idly by and permit the Federal tax authorities on their own initiative to reverse its long-term construction of the tax statute and promulgate new rules embodying concepts, which are going to turn the tax law into a legal battleground for years to come. If the law is to be changed, Congress—not the Treasury Department—should change it.

The bill restores the law and continues the interpretation which existed prior to 1965. It does nothing more. If the Treasury Department wants the law changed, let them come to us and make a case for the amendments they desire.

I sincerely trust that prompt and favorable action will be taken on this measure by the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1399) to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

MID-DECADE CENSUS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], for appropriate reference, a bill to improve the statistics of the United States by providing for a census of population, housing, and unemployment in the years 1968, 1975, and every 10 years thereafter.

The effect of this legislation will be to establish a reasonably complete national census every 5 years in place of our present program of decennial censuses

combined with special surveys and estimates.

The need for a full and accurate periodic inventory of the American people has been recognized from the founding of our Republic. The Constitution of the United States requires a census once in each decade and, since 1790, we have taken 17 such headcounts.

From the information they provide, lawmakers and administrators at every level of government conceive and execute a broad spectrum of programs, ranging from educating our young to building the highways that span the continent.

Business and industry analyze census statistics when arriving at decisions involving the investment of billions of stockholders' dollars. Historians and social scientists trace and record the ever-changing population patterns of our Nation and reach conclusions about where we have come from and where we may be headed.

In fact, with the passing of each year the demands for detailed, fresh data on America's most vital resource—her people—are multiplying.

Since 1960, the United States has gained millions of new residents. Between April 1960 and July 1964, Nevada's population increased by 43 percent. Arizona's population climbed by 21 percent during the same period, while my home State of Florida gained nearly 18 percent.

Furthermore, growth has not been the only characteristic of the dynamic American population. Demographers say that one American in five changes addresses at least once a year. The impact of such constant migration is most keenly felt in those States which are rapidly absorbing new citizens. State and local governments must provide expanded public services such as schools, police, fire protection, highways, sanitary sewers, and a myriad of other facilities necessary to the life of every community.

School officials, in particular, are faced with a problem of great dimensions due to population mobility. A 1959-60 study of the Los Angeles elementary school transfers showed 48 percent of the enrollment moved into or out of the district, or from school to school within the district, during a single school year.

To give an indication of the restless movement of all Americans, one need only note further that between 1950 and 1960, the State of Florida added 1,617,000 new residents through migration from other areas. In the same period, New Jersey gained 600,000 persons who had formerly made their homes elsewhere. And some estimates indicate that since 1960, Los Angeles County alone has gained nearly 1 million persons.

The most significant fact concerning the statistics on growth and mobility just cited is that only those figures for the decade between 1950 and 1960 are known to be precise. The others, based on sample surveys and projections, cannot be proven—under present law—until 1970. According to statistical experts, the farther we move away from 1960, the more woefully inadequate our census data will become.

Yet it is from this data that decisions affecting the lives of every American and

involving billions of dollars must be made. State and local governments, recognizing the necessity for up-to-date information, have had to request special censuses from the Census Bureau. Since 1960, more than 500 of these special inventories have been conducted—yet even these touched only about 12 million people out of a nation with more than 190 million inhabitants.

Thus, while special censuses may be helpful to individual State and local administrators, they cannot give us any overall national picture. They cannot provide the U.S. Congress or Federal administrators with exact statistical knowledge on all areas of this vast land. Therefore, such legislation as the Economic Opportunity Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Library Services Act Amendments of 1964, and many others which provide for fund allocations according to need, must be administered with reliance on 1959 income figures—figures which are now some 8 years out of date.

Because we have tied ourselves to a census program devised when the entire population of the country did not equal the population increase between 1950 and 1960, we are currently distributing billions of dollars to State and local government using population and income data collected years ago.

As has been observed before, Mr. President, we have a more accurate count of cattle in this country than we do of people. This is because the United States takes a quinquennial census of agriculture.

Further, in the decade between 1945 and 1955, 20 nations took more censuses of population than we did. Japan, West Germany, Sweden, Norway, and Australia were among those which did so.

We cannot lag behind these countries in the field of vital statistics. Certainly if we are to keep pace with the growing needs of our changing society, we must be able to trace those changes as precisely as possible.

I am confident that the adoption of a quinquennial census will do much to strengthen our national statistical program. It will aid business and government in making the vital decisions that will keep our country moving forward.

Speaking for myself and for Senator KUCHEL, I wholeheartedly urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1400) to improve the statistics of the United States by providing for a census in the years 1968, 1975, and every 10 years thereafter, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

TO AMEND THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT OF 1965

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and for other purposes, to better meet the needs of the American people for outdoor recreation opportunities. I

ask that the bill be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to overcome the problem of rapidly increasing cost of Federal and federally assisted recreation areas financed from the land and water conservation fund. The problem of land price escalation for public recreation lands and waters has been of increasing concern over the past few years to the executive and legislative branches of Government, as well as to the conservation and recreation organizations and the general public.

The President in his message of January 30 on "Protecting Our Natural Heritage," referred to the problem and recommended a solution. In this respect the message reads as follows:

We are seriously hampered by rapidly rising land costs when we seek new areas for recreation. Average land prices are increasing at a rate of almost ten percent a year. The cost of land for recreation is spiraling at a considerably higher rate. This diminishes the effectiveness of our program of State grants and Federal purchases of land for park and recreation areas. We must act promptly to assure that we can acquire needed recreation lands before the price becomes prohibitive. The most effective means of controlling the increase in the price of land is to acquire the lands quickly after authorization by the Congress.

The problem and its solution could not be stated more succinctly.

Many tools for overcoming the escalation problem have been examined recently. All of them zero in on two main points: First, the need to have an adequate amount of funds to purchase the recreation areas, and second, the need to have the funds promptly available in order to acquire areas as quickly as possible after congressional authorization.

With respect to the first point, it has become evident that the land and water conservation fund as presently constituted will not be adequate to take care of minimum needs over the next few years. Rising land prices and a number of other factors have placed a greater burden on the fund than the current annual level of revenues to the fund—about \$115 million—are able to meet.

The 89th Congress authorized 23 new Federal recreation areas involving the acquisition of about 250,000 acres at an estimated cost of \$119 million. Among the outstanding of these are the following:

Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area in Pennsylvania and New Jersey,
Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore,
Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area in California,
Assateague Island National Seashore in Maryland and Virginia,
Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore in Michigan,
Guadalupe National Park in Texas,
Cape Lookout National Seashore in North Carolina,
Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area in West Virginia,
Mt. Rogers National Recreation Area in Virginia.

The President in his natural heritage message pointed out that there are still a number of additions needed in the Federal recreation estate if we are to meet the needs of future Americans for

open spaces and outdoor recreational pursuits.

These problems are not unique to the Federal Government. The States and local governments are confronted with similar problems in their acquisition programs. Their development needs are also pressing.

Mr. President, subsection 1(a) of the bill I have introduced today would provide additional sources of revenue to the land and water conservation fund for the next 5 years in order to provide the wherewithal to meet the immediate crisis. This would adequately finance the Nation's minimum need for outdoor recreation resources and help overcome the vexing problem of spiraling recreation land prices.

It provides that from July 1, 1967, through June 30, 1972, all receipts of the Department of the Interior from mineral leasing of public lands and the Outer Continental Shelf lands that currently go into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury shall be deposited in the land and water conservation fund. These Department of the Interior revenues will range from about \$100 million to \$400 million annually to the fund, based on average receipts for fiscal years 1957-66 and anticipated increases in Outer Continental Shelf revenues. Some of the revenues that have been collected from the Outer Continental Shelf lands are presently held in escrow, pending court decision on the distribution to the United States and Louisiana. Any money released to the United States from escrow during the 5-year period, under the provision of subsection 1(a), will also be deposited in the land and water conservation fund.

Subsection 1(a) of the bill also provides for the deposit in the land and water conservation fund beginning July 1, 1967, and ending June 30, 1972, of all those receipts from the national forests and national grasslands collected by the Department of Agriculture which currently go into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. These revenues would amount to about \$80 million annually based on the average unearmarked receipts for fiscal years 1957-66.

The bill would have no effect on those revenues from national forests or from leasing of minerals on public lands which now support other specified programs, such as the reclamation fund, or national forest roads and trails. Nor would it affect present provisions of law governing the sharing of mineral revenues and national forest receipts with the States.

The additional revenues to the fund, like revenues to the fund from existing sources, would be subject to the normal budgetary process and appropriation by Congress.

To take care of the second point I previously made—namely, the need for acquisition of areas as quickly as possible after congressional authorization, subsection 1(b) provides, with certain limitations, for advance contract authority for the acquisition of Federal recreation areas currently authorized. The advance contract authority would run only to the type of land and water areas cur-

rently authorized to be financed from the land and water conservation fund. Moreover, as is presently the case, no acquisition obligations could be incurred under this authority unless the acquisition is otherwise authorized by law. Obligations under this authority would be charged against the land and water conservation fund.

Subsection 1(b) of the bill provides three additional important limitations on the proposed advance contract authority, as follows:

First. The authority would be limited to the next 2 years;

Second. Obligations at any one area may not exceed the land acquisition ceiling established by Congress for that particular area; and

Third. Total annual obligations under this authority would be limited to \$30 million.

The purpose of subsection 1(b) is to have a limited means of financing the purchase of recreation areas quickly after authorization by Congress before competitive interest becomes widespread and sends the land prices soaring. It has been found that the most pronounced increases in the value of land occur at about the time of authorization. The unique qualities which make lands attractive for setting aside as a Federal recreation area also appeal to private investors and developers. Even after a project is authorized, prices become steadily higher, due in part to the Government's commitment to acquire specific properties.

In analyzing the time lapse at 14 recently authorized Federal recreation areas, it was found that an average of 24.2 months elapsed between the time the proposal was first introduced in Congress and its enactment. An average of 16 months elapsed from date of enactment to the first appropriation, for these same areas.

Let us take a hypothetical case. A Federal recreation area at the time it is proposed and introduced in Congress has an estimated land acquisition cost of \$15 million. Two years later—the average time lapse on recent authorizations—this hypothetical area is authorized. If recreation lands increase at about 15 to 20 percent a year, the land acquisition cost of that area by the time of authorization has risen to somewhere between \$18.5 and \$21.5 million. After that, a period of another 16 months goes by before appropriations for that area can be made. These 16 months add another \$3 to \$6 million. Therefore, instead of the original land cost of \$15 million, the cost during the 3½ years, average length of time between introduction of a proposal and the first appropriations can be made has risen to somewhere between \$22 to \$27 million due to spiraling prices for recreation lands.

This illustrates the great need to provide the Federal agencies with a tool with which to keep the public cost of Federal recreation areas to a minimum. The advance contract authority proposed in subsection 1(b) of the bill I have introduced is urgently needed.

The second section of the bill provides the Secretary of the Interior with authority to use the leaseback or sellback

method of acquiring the desired degree of land control within units of the national park system. It also provides an extremely limited authority for land exchanges where both subject properties are within the boundaries of units, and then only to be used where exchange is otherwise authorized by law.

Congress by enactment of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 established the policy that the Federal Government should give leadership in providing urgently needed outdoor recreation opportunities for the American people. Since then Congress has authorized a substantial number of Federal recreation areas and encouraged the States through financial assistance to establish public recreation areas at the State and local levels. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], in a recent letter to me expressed his great concern about the alarming escalation of prices for land acquisition for these purposes. In expressing his hope for some solution to this vexing problem he thought it appropriate that my committee give full consideration to the situation through the vehicle of this proposed legislation.

I believe that it is imperative that we keep faith with the American people by providing the necessary tools and funds to the administrators who are eligible to participate in this important program, so that the establishment of authorized recreation areas can become a reality. I hope that other Senators will join me in sponsoring this bill and urge that Congress enact this measure promptly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1401) to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JACKSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1401

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 2 of title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) OTHER REVENUES.—All revenues received on and after July 1, 1967 and prior to July 1, 1972, to the extent such revenues otherwise would be deposited in miscellaneous receipts of the United States Treasury, under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (41 Stat. 437; 30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.), as amended (except revenues received from lands within naval petroleum reserves), and under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 462; 43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.), as amended (including the funds held in escrow under an interim agreement of October 12, 1956, between the United States and Louisiana, to the extent the United States is determined to be entitled to such escrow funds), and by or on account of the Forest Service which are disposed of pursuant to the provisions of law contained in section 499, title 16, United States Code."

(b) Title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 is amended by add-

ing at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 8. Not to exceed \$30,000,000 of the money authorized to be appropriated from the fund by section 3 of this Act may be obligated by contract during each of fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the acquisition of lands, waters, or interests therein within areas specified in section 6(a) (1) of this Act. Any such contract may be executed by the head of the department concerned, within limitations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior. Any such contract so entered into shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the United States and shall be liquidated with money appropriated from the fund specifically for liquidation of such contract obligation. No contract may be entered into for the acquisition of property pursuant to this section unless such acquisition is otherwise authorized by Federal law."

SEC. 2. (a) With respect to any property acquired by the Secretary of the Interior within a unit of the National Park System or miscellaneous area, the Secretary may convey a freehold or leasehold interest therein, subject to such terms and conditions as will assure the use of the property in a manner which is, in the judgment of the Secretary, consistent with the purpose for which the area was authorized by the Congress. In any case in which the Secretary exercises his discretion to convey such interest, he shall do so to the highest bidder, in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, but such conveyance shall be at not less than the fair market value of the interest, as determined by the Secretary; except that if any such conveyance is proposed within two years after the property to be conveyed is acquired by the Secretary, he shall allow the last owner of record of such property thirty days following the date on which he is notified by the Secretary in writing that such property is to be conveyed within which to notify the Secretary that such owner wishes to acquire such interest. Upon receiving such timely request, the Secretary shall convey such interest to such person upon payment by him of, or agreement by him to pay, an amount equal to the highest bid price.

(b) Within a unit of the National Park System or miscellaneous area in which exchange is authorized by law as a method for property acquisition, the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property or interest therein within such unit or area and in exchange therefor he may convey to the grantor of such property or interest any federally owned property or interest therein within any such unit or area, subject to such terms and conditions as he deems necessary. The values of the properties so exchanged either shall be approximately equal, or if they are not approximately equal, the values shall be equalized by the payment of cash to the grantor from funds appropriated for the acquisition of land for the area, or to the Secretary as the circumstances require.

(c) The proceeds received from any conveyance under this section shall be credited to the land and water conservation fund in the Treasury of the United States.

ELIMINATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY RETIREMENT TEST

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, since the passage of the Social Security Act in 1935, one of its most controversial provisions has been the so-called retirement test or earnings limitation, regulating the amount of money a person may earn and still draw social security benefits.

As the system presently operates, each beneficiary under age 72, excepting disabled workers, may earn no more than \$1,500 a year without suffering reduction

in social security benefits. If the beneficiary exceeds these income limits, his benefits will be reduced by \$1 for every \$2 of annual earnings between \$1,500 and \$2,700, and by \$1 for every \$1 of annual earnings in excess of \$2,700.

There are proposals to again revise the retirement test this year, but, as a matter of equity, the test ought to be eliminated entirely. Social security benefits should be paid as a matter of right. Benefits are related to the wages, over the years, of the employee contributor and should be payable without the imposition of any limitation on earnings in later life.

Mr. President, during the depression, when social security was first enacted, it was thought necessary to remove older workers from the job market in order to make way for younger ones. If this was ever a valid concept, it has long since ceased to be. Our depression-ridden economy of scarcity has been replaced by an economy of plenty. There is no longer any need to remove older people from the job market. Indeed, the retention of the retirement test in our social security system, by preventing many older persons from working, actually deprives the country of valuable skills and larger productivity.

Furthermore, the retirement test causes hardship for those individuals who must work to supplement their benefits. The maximum amount an individual can currently receive a year in a primary benefit is \$1,631. The minimum is \$528, and the average is only about \$1,000. The retirement test causes great inequities in a large number of cases where the individual has need for more income than social security benefits can provide, forcing vast numbers of retirees to live on a marginal income bordering on poverty.

The present retirement test, moreover, operates in a most unfair way. It applies to persons who must work but not to those who draw nonwork income. A man, for example, who has an income of \$15,000 a year, or more, from dividends, interest, and rent can get every dollar of his social security benefits. On the other hand, a man whose only income is from his own work will lose some or all of his social security benefits if he earns over \$1,500, one-tenth as much.

Under the present test, a man entitled to the minimum social security benefit of \$44 a month will actually get none at all if he earns \$2,548 a year. On the other hand, a man entitled to a social security benefit of \$150 a month, who earns the same amount, that is, \$2,548 a year, will be actually paid benefits by social security of \$1,272 a year. He would not lose all his social security benefits unless he earned \$4,500 a year. Thus the present system discriminates against those having the lowest social security entitlements, the very people who need the extra earnings most.

There is an exception to the provisions of the test, but it too favors the better-off beneficiary. The law provides that benefits will be paid for any month a person does not earn more than \$125. But if the man who has the \$150-a-month benefit earned \$500 in 1 month and \$120 each month thereafter he

would get all but \$150 of his benefits for the year.

Obviously, people receiving minimum benefits and still able to work are the chief victims of the present restrictive law.

Mr. President, elimination of the so-called retirement test, or earnings limitation, is needed to eliminate these inequities. I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to accomplish this goal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1403) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title, introduced by Mr. CHURCH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

DR. JORGE G. MESTAS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I introduce today a private bill for the relief of Dr. Jorge G. Mestas. Dr. Mestas is a Cuban refugee who was graduated from Havana University and took special training in radiology in Spain. He was a practicing radiologist in Cuba until he escaped that country and came to the United States on February 27, 1963.

The doctor lived in Miami, Fla., as a refugee and was registered there in alien file No. XXXXXXXX. While in Miami he took several months of postgraduate medical training at the University of Miami.

In January of 1964, he went to Kiowa, Kans., to assist two general practitioners with their radiology work. He is presently a resident intern at St. Francis Hospital in Wichita, Kans., where he will complete his work July 1 of this year.

Kansas has a law, as do many other States, which prohibit a medical doctor from practicing unless he holds valid citizenship. Under the general provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, an immigrant alien must reside in the United States for 5 years after such admission before applying for naturalization.

Dr. Mestas was admitted to the United States for permanent residence on May 24, 1966. While the Immigration Service is sympathetic to Dr. Mestas' situation, time spent in this country as a nonimmigrant or Cuban refugee may not be credited toward accumulating the required period of residency.

Under the terms of Public Law 89-732, Dr. Mestas' day of entry would be placed at May 2, 1964. My bill today asks that Dr. Mestas be considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his arrival in Florida, February 27, 1963. With the passage of this bill, Dr. Mestas then would be eligible to practice medicine legally in the State of Kansas and serve four hospital communities in south central Kansas.

Mr. President, there are many similar cases such as Dr. Mestas' and I ask that this case be given every consideration because of the desperate need for radiologists in these Kansas hospitals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1406) for the relief of Dr. Jorge Mestas, introduced by Mr. PEARSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS TO PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND ACT OF 1966

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], I am introducing a bill he proposes to offer this year to revise several features of the Presidential Election Campaign Act of 1966. The chairman has studied last year's act and the comments of those who have spoken of it. He has stated this year, as he did last year that the present act for financing presidential election campaigns is not a perfect piece of legislation and that it can be improved on. However, since this is the first major step that has ever been taken to eliminate the threat of improper influence from the highest office in our land, he does not feel it should be lightly dealt with.

The chairman would have preferred to consider these amendments and others that Senators or interested parties may propose in the orderly manner, through the hearing process. I am confident that when he returns tomorrow he will urge the Senate not to rush into floor amendments to repeal last year's law, but to give this important matter the attention and deliberation it deserves, by rejecting the amendment of Senator GORE and Senator WILLIAMS and permitting the Committee on Finance to study the issues, objections, and recommendations of anyone who wants to present them. Both of these Senators are on the committee, and their rights will not be prejudiced to any extent by this procedure.

The chairman has asked me to request that a summary he has prepared outlining his amendments be included at this point in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that this summary be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1407) to amend the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966 so as to provide safeguards for the proper use of moneys paid to political parties from the presidential election campaign fund, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS (for Mr. LONG of Louisiana), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The summary is as follows:

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND ACT—SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS PROPOSED TO BE OFFERED BY RUSSELL B. LONG, DEMOCRAT, OF LOUISIANA

1. *Honest Election Act of 1967:* The title of these amendments would be the "Honest Election Act of 1967."

2. *Tax Check-off:* The \$1 tax check-off

would be deleted, and a permanent appropriation to defray the costs of Presidential election campaigns would be substituted for it. The formula of \$1 per vote (and the \$5 million floor) in the existing law would be retained.

3. *Private Contributions:* A major political party must elect to have all its Presidential campaign expenses paid either from the Presidential Election Campaign Fund or from private contributions. No payment from the Fund could be made to a major party if it has accepted or spent any contribution for its Presidential campaign; but a minor party could receive contributions for its Presidential campaign so long as the contributions plus the Fund payment do not exceed the party's actual expenditures or the Fund payment to which a major party is entitled.

4. *Campaign Expenditure Guidelines:* Seventy-five percent of the Fund payments received by a political party must be used for the following kinds of expenses: reasonable allowance for salaries of presidential campaign personnel; reasonable allowance for rent; television and radio production and time; newspaper and periodical advertising; printing, postage and distribution of campaign literature; telephone, telegraph and data processing; travel and transportation. The remaining twenty-five percent of the Fund payment could be used for any purpose, including items listed above, determined to be proper by the Comptroller General and his Advisory Board. No part of the twenty-five percent could be spent for paying poll watchers, transporting voters to the polls, providing food and refreshment on election day, or for similar purposes on election day.

5. *Audits and Repayments:* The Comptroller General would be directed to conduct a thorough audit of the Presidential campaign expenses of each political party and to require repayment from the party of money used for other than Presidential campaign expenses. Unless the use of the money for other than Presidential campaign expenses was due to reasonable cause, a civil penalty of 25 percent of the amount involved would be assessed against the party.

6. *Disclosure:* The Comptroller General would be directed to file a detailed report to Congress of the Fund payments to each party, the expenses of each party for which payment was made, and any repayments which a party might be required to make. This report would become a public document.

7. *Criminal Penalty:* A fine of up to \$10,000 or imprisonment of up to 5 years, or both, would be imposed for a willful misuse of funds received under the Act, including the use of such funds for personal purposes or kick-backs.

8. *Vice Presidents:* A clarifying amendment would assure payment for the campaign costs of Vice-Presidential as well as Presidential candidates. The amendment also would define treasury and treasurer of a political party as treasury and treasurer of the national committee of a major party or treasury and treasurer of an organization designated by a minor party candidate if the party had no national committee.

9. *Three-Million-Dollar Limitation:* A clarifying amendment would assure that Fund payments received by a political party would be considered contributions and the expenditures by the political party with respect to which a Fund payment was received would not be taken into account in applying the Federal law which restricts to \$3 million contributions to and expenditures by a political committee.

INCORPORATION OF U.S. TRACK AND FIELD ASSOCIATION

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, more with a feeling of frustration and sadness

than with anger, it is my conclusion that the controversy between the Amateur Athletic Union and the U.S. Track and Field Federation is of such duration, of such injury to the student athlete and to the best interests of amateur athletics, and that it continues to be so far removed from a reasonable settlement, that Federal legislation is required.

Difficult problems bring forth difficult solutions. And legislation in this field, so properly within the jurisdiction of the nongovernment direction, is most difficult to conceive.

Three main legislative proposals are suggested. First, is the creation of a "third body," which would handle U.S. track and field on the international level and would be the supreme policymaking body for all track and field domestically. The second is the creation of an arbitration board with powers to make binding decisions, and possessing, of course, machinery for enforcement. And third is the appointment of a Federal commissioner or agency with complete jurisdiction to promulgate rules and regulations for the settlement of any and all disputes.

It will be my intention today and in the days ahead to introduce legislation embodying these and perhaps other suggestions so that the Senate, and the appropriate committee, will have before it items of legislation which would represent in essence alternatives or a working paper to achieve the goal desired.

In pursuance thereof, Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution to authorize the incorporation of the U.S. Track and Field Association under a Federal charter. The association, a private corporation, would assume responsibility as the supreme authority as to policy concerning amateur track and field events and participants in the United States.

This would formulate the aforesaid "third body" attempt for a solution.

Mr. President, these are indeed troubled times for amateur track and field in America. For more than 6 years our Nation has endured an open and deplorable power struggle between the two most powerful operating groups of track and field organizations in the Nation—the AAU and the USTFF, an arm of the NCAA. These organizations have been unable to solve major or petty differences. Responsible men have acted in an irresponsible manner. This power struggle has hindered the position of the United States in international competition and perhaps even more importantly the amateur athletes themselves. Nor is this the first time, Mr. President, that a dispute has erupted between these two groups. Indeed, the controversy spans 60 or more years. From time to time tentative and weak solutions have been found, feeble truces have been drawn. But as the years stretch out these solutions have become weaker and the controversy has become stronger between the parties involved.

The record will show that Gen. Douglas MacArthur in past years offered his good services in an attempt to arbitrate the differences between the groups. His efforts resulted only in a short-term moratorium which lasted through the 1964 Olympics. An attempt by the Sen-

ate itself by a resolution in 1965 created an arbitration board appointed by the Vice President of the United States. That board, representing the sense of Congress and acting in the interests of the public has sought without success to reach a firm and final arbitration of the controversy. The moratorium I spoke of has been breached. Threats and talk of legal actions replace reasonable discussion.

Exactly, what is at stake, Mr. President? With what should the leaders of these athletic organizations concern themselves? There is, in my judgment, only one simple answer. Yet it is obvious to me that the leaders of both groups, instead of trying to settle their differences, are so busy trying to protect their own vested interests that their prime considerations—the best interest of amateur athletics and the best interest of the Nation—have been forgotten, or set aside.

If this statement is too harsh, Mr. President, I am quick to add that I realize that there are many individuals connected with both organizations who have no interest in a continuing dispute, who have no desire to act to the detriment of the athlete, the sport itself, or the country. These persons could care less about the dispute. These individuals have only the interest of amateur athletics at heart. Unfortunately, such men do not seem to be in control of their respective organizations.

Mr. President, I purport to be no expert in the area of track and field. Nor do I offer this legislation as some magical formula or panacea for the problems involved. Nevertheless, as a member of the Commerce Committee I did participate most actively in the 1965 hearings and more recently I have again devoted considerable time to a study of the problem. The legislation offered today represents only one possible solution. Other suggestions are sure to come. But something must be done now.

The legislation proposed would establish a single authority to govern track and field domestically and to coordinate all efforts among its members. The membership would embrace, not only the various operating groups but also any other organizations with a substantial interest in track and field sports. It is the purpose of this joint resolution to permit no one existing organization to control the association. Instead, it is the hope that a balanced board of directors would set its policy. In this regard, although five coaches from various institutional organizations would serve on the board of directors, as now proposed, they would not constitute a majority of the board and would by no means have control of it.

Mr. President, the proposed U.S. Track and Field Association would be the supreme policymaking body of track and field in the United States. It is hoped, under the authority granted by this legislation, that it would be the U.S. representative in the International Amateur Athletic Federation and thereby serve as our representative for all international competition, except perhaps for the Pan-American and Olympic games, which are operated under separate charters granted by the Congress.

This body would arbitrate any differences which might arise between the various operating groups in the country and the decision would be binding. To this extent, the compulsory arbitration proposal heretofore noted is incorporated in this legislation. Above all, this so-called third body would seek to protect the interest of the amateur track and field athlete.

Let it be emphasized that the creation of this new association would not do away with the AAU nor the USTFF nor the NCAA. These groups would continue to serve important and necessary functions in the common goal of bettering our track and field program. If this proposal would cause the AAU to lose a portion of their present power, let it be noted that this power is not in any manner conferred on the NCAA. It merely recognizes that which is most obvious; that is, no solution will be forthcoming as long as both groups continue on their present respective courses. The athletes will continue to be caught in the middle, suffering penalties where they had only desired the right to compete for themselves, for their schools, and for their country.

Mr. President, for those who would protest the entrance of the Federal Government into this field, let me say that I share their anxiety. If there were a single ray of hope left, if there were a single alternative or option available, this proposal would never have been made. However, the sad truth is that the parties themselves have made this matter the business of the Federal Government if it is to protect the public interest. And they have done so by repeatedly refusing the pleas and directives of the public, the athletes, and indeed the Senate itself. In other matters, it has recently been said that in an area of big business or big unions, there is the necessity for the Government to act as a big umpire and referee. Perhaps this is the case here.

Mr. President, perhaps it would not be good form to anticipate objections, but I must make note of the fact that many will argue that Congress lacks authority to legislate as to which body or organization will represent the United States in the International Amateur Athletic Foundation. While this may be a legitimate technical objection, nevertheless, the realities of the situation lead me to believe that any bona fide amateur organization specifically designated by the U.S. Government will be duly recognized by the international body.

In this connection it is necessary to recall that many persons who testified before the Commerce Committee in 1965 felt that the Congress could resolve the situation by amending the U.S. Olympic Committee charter to provide for a more equitable representation for some groups on that committee. This is certainly a proposal which should be seriously considered and particularly so if the question of the Congress' authority to act is seriously and successfully questioned.

Mr. President, amateur athletics in this country represent one of our finest institutions. No activity better represents the American way of life. The amateur athlete participates for the love

of the sport, for self-achievement, and for the honor he may bring, not only to himself but to the institution he represents, or indeed, to the country itself. The jurisdictional and organizational dispute has served to discredit both the athlete and the institution he represents. We cannot continue to permit situations to develop such as that which occurred at that national AAU meet in San Diego in 1965, where the athlete was forced to choose between discredit to his school and the possible loss of his scholarship and the giving up of his opportunity to represent himself or his institution or his country in international track and field competition.

Only recently we witnessed the fact that a bona fide world record was not recognized by the international body because of the feuding of the sanctioning organizations.

Thus, Mr. President, and in conclusion, I present this legislation because I believe the interest of our amateur track and field athletes is being harmed, because I believe the international position of this country in international sports is being endangered, and because the public interest is not being served.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 59) to authorize the incorporation of the U.S. Track and Field Association, introduced by Mr. PEARSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 59

Whereas disputes have existed for many years between the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States, the National Collegiate Athletic Association, other amateur athletic organizations, and their affiliates or associates; and

Whereas these disputes have discouraged the full development of amateur athletics in the United States and the maximum performance by athletes representing the United States in international competition; and

Whereas the parties have not been able to resolve their differences through their own efforts or through previous arbitration efforts; and

Whereas it is necessary and desirable for the United States to maintain a vigorous amateur athletic program that will field the best possible teams in domestic and international competition, will protect and provide for the welfare of the individual amateur athlete, will achieve the broadest possible participation by amateur athletes in competitive sports, and will maintain a harmonious and cooperative relationship among all amateur athletic organizations; and

Whereas the independent board of arbitration appointed pursuant to Senate Resolution 147, agreed to September 20, 1965, was unable to resolve the disputes; and

Whereas amateur athletics have a substantial effect upon interstate commerce; and

Whereas it is essential that means be provided whereby such disputes can be equitably and finally resolved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby

authorized to be created a body corporate by the name of "United States Track and Field Association" (hereinafter referred to as the "Association"). The Association shall maintain its principal offices and national headquarters in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, and may hold its annual and special meetings in such places as are determined by the incorporators appointed pursuant to this Joint Resolution.

PROCESS OF ORGANIZATION

SEC. 2. The President of the United States shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, eleven incorporators who shall serve as the initial board of directors until their successors are selected and qualified. Such incorporators are authorized to meet to complete the organization of the Association by the adoption of a constitution and bylaws in conformance with the provisions of this Joint Resolution, the election of officers, and by doing all things necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this Joint Resolution.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 3. (a) (1) The Association shall have a board of directors consisting of eleven individuals who are citizens of the United States, to be selected in the manner set forth in the bylaws, as follows:

(1) two from among coaches at any institutions of higher education which are members of the National Collegiate Athletic Association;

(2) two from among representatives of the membership of the Amateur Athletic Union;

(3) one from among coaches at institutions of higher education which are members of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics;

(4) one from among coaches at junior or community colleges which are members of the National Junior College Athletic Association;

(5) one from among coaches at secondary schools which are members of the National Federation of Student High School Athletic Associations;

(6) one from among members of the Armed Forces engaged in track and field activities;

(7) one from among representatives of the general public;

(8) one amateur track and field athlete;

(9) one from among members of the advisory committee established pursuant to section 3(b) of this Joint Resolution.

(2) The failure of any class of directors to qualify shall not affect the powers of the Association. The incorporators appointed pursuant to this Joint Resolution shall make provision in the bylaws for the filling of any vacancy caused by any such failure.

(3) No member of the board of directors who has served a full term as determined in the bylaws shall be eligible to serve a second consecutive term.

(b) The Association shall have an advisory committee consisting of representatives, to be selected in the manner set forth in the bylaws, from all member groups or organizations which are not otherwise represented on the board of directors as set forth in parts (1) through (8) of section 3(a)(1) of the Joint Resolution.

OBJECTS AND PURPOSES OF THE ASSOCIATION

SEC. 4. The objects and purposes of the Association shall be

(1) to exercise exclusive jurisdiction over all policy matters pertaining to track and field operations in the United States, including the policies for sanctioning of open track and field events;

(2) to arbitrate a binding decision for such disputes between regional or national organizations engaged in sponsoring or encouraging track and field events as are shown to be harmful to the best interests of amateur track and field in the United States;

(3) to act as the sole track and field representative of the United States to the International Amateur Athletic Federation;

(4) to exercise exclusive jurisdiction over all matters pertaining to the participation of the United States in any international competition in track and field events except for the Olympic Games and the Pan-American Games, including the representation of the United States in such competition, and over the organization of such competition when held in the United States;

(5) to select and obtain for the United States the most competent amateur representation possible in such competition;

(6) to represent and protect the individual right to compete of amateur track and field athletes in any case in which such athletes are unfairly restricted or restrained from participating.

POWERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

SEC. 5. The Association shall have perpetual succession and power—

(1) to organize, select, finance, and control the representation of the United States in international competition in track and field events except the Olympic Games and the Pan-American Games, and to appoint committees or other governing bodies in connection with such representation;

(2) to sue and be sued;

(3) to make contracts;

(4) to acquire, hold, and dispose of such real and personal property as may be necessary for its corporate purposes;

(5) to accept gifts, legacies, and devises in furtherance of its corporate purposes;

(6) to borrow money to carry out its corporate purposes, issue notes, bonds, or other evidences of indebtedness therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, subject in each case to the laws of the United States or of any State;

(7) to establish, regulate, and discontinue subordinate organizations, and to receive and expel as members of the Association, such existing organizations of a patriotic, educational, civic, or athletic character, as may be deemed desirable and proper to carry out the corporate purposes;

(8) to adopt and alter a seal, emblem, and other insignia;

(9) to adopt and alter a constitution and bylaws not inconsistent with the laws of the United States or of any State;

(10) to establish and maintain offices for the conduct of the affairs of the Association;

(11) to publish a newspaper, magazine, or other publication consistent with its corporate purposes; and

(12) to do any and all acts and things necessary and proper to carry out the purposes of the Association.

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 6. Eligibility for membership in the Association shall be determined in accordance with the constitution and the bylaws of the Association.

NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF ASSOCIATION

SEC. 7. The Association shall be nonpolitical and, as an organization, shall not promote the candidacy of any person seeking public office.

PROHIBITION AGAINST ISSUANCE OF STOCK OR BUSINESS ACTIVITIES

SEC. 8. The Association shall have no power to issue capital stock or to engage in business for pecuniary profit or gain.

PENALTY FOR FRAUDULENT PRETENSE OF MEMBERSHIP OR USE OF INSIGNIA

SEC. 9. (a) From and after June 1, 1968, it shall be unlawful for any person within the jurisdiction of the United States to falsely or fraudulently hold himself out as or represent or pretend himself to be a mem-

ber of or an agent for the Association or subordinate organizations for the purpose of soliciting, collecting, or receiving money or material; or for any person to wear or display the insignia thereof for the fraudulent purpose of inducing the belief that he is at such time a member of or an agent for the Association or any of its subordinate organizations. It shall be unlawful for any person, corporation, or association, other than the Association, or its subordinate organizations and its duly authorized employees and agents for the purpose of trade, theatrical exhibition, athletic performance, and competition or as an advertisement to induce the sale of any article whatsoever or attendance at any theatrical exhibition, athletic performance, and competition or for any business or charitable purpose to use within the territory of the United States and its possessions, the emblems of the Association.

(b) If any person violates the provisions of this section he shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be liable to fine of not less than \$100 or more than \$500 or imprisonment for a term not exceeding 1 year, or both, for each and every offense.

AGENTS FOR SERVICE OF PROCESS

SEC. 10. As a condition precedent to the exercise of any power or privilege granted or conferred under this Joint Resolution, the Association shall file in the office of the secretary of state, or similar officer, in each State the name and post-office address of an authorized agent of the Association in such State upon whom local process or demands against the Association may be served.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL

SEC. 11. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Joint Resolution at any time is expressly reserved.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 12. The Association shall, on or before the 1st day of March in each year, transmit to the Congress a report of its proceedings for the preceding calendar year, including a full and complete statement of its receipts and expenditures. Such reports shall not be printed as public documents.

ACQUISITION OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES OF EXISTING TRACK AND FIELD ASSOCIATION

SEC. 13. The Association may acquire any or all of the assets of an existing track and field association upon discharging or satisfactorily providing for payment and discharge of all the liabilities of such acquired association.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON KING COVE HARBOR, ALASKA (S. DOC. NO. 13)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], I present a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated January 10, 1967, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of the reports on King Cove Harbor, Alaska, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, adopted August 16, 1960.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

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

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT FOR PUBLIC UTILITIES

AMENDMENT NO. 137

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, during consideration of the adoption of the investment tax credit, much discussion occurred as to the propriety of granting it to public utilities—and other industries where charges for services, and consequently the rate of return on shareholders equity, is established by a regulatory agency. The provision as enacted granted the investment tax credit to public utilities but limited it in their cases to 3 percent of qualified investments, rather than 7 percent which applies generally.

It was the intention of Congress in adopting the investment credit to provide an incentive for modernization and growth of industry in this country. In 1964, Congress added a provision to the Revenue Act of that year—section 203(e)—which states that this intention applied to the regulated industries including public utilities as well as to the nonregulated industries. The thought was that if the investment credit of a public utility were to be taken into account for ratemaking purposes by Federal regulatory agencies, the desired incentive would be lost, since the benefits of the credit would be passed through to the consumers rather than retained by the companies. In order to achieve the desired incentive effect, the 1964 provision provides that in the case of public utilities, Federal regulatory agencies are not, without the utilities' permission, to require more than a proportionate part of an investment credit to be treated as reducing the taxpayer's Federal income tax liabilities. The effect of this, in general, is to provide that the benefit of the credit may be passed through to the consumer over the useful life of the investment property.

In the case of electric utilities, recent consideration of the problem has demonstrated that delaying the benefit of the credit to the consumers is wrong. My amendment eliminates this restriction on the authority of Federal regulatory agencies to exercise their judgment in determining a fair rate of return in the case of furnishers of electrical energy by providing that the 1964 provision is not to apply to property used predominantly in the trade or business of furnishing or selling electrical energy.

This amendment is to be effective upon enactment.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment lie on the desk, and that it be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment (No. 137) is as follows:

Renumber section 4 of the bill as section 5 and insert after section 3 thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 4. Section 203(e) (1) of the Revenue Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-272) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'The preceding sentence

shall not apply in the case of property used predominantly in the trade or business of the furnishing or sale of electrical energy."

RESTORATION OF INVESTMENT CREDIT AND ALLOWANCE OF ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION ON CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 138 THROUGH 140

Mr. PROUTY submitted three amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 141

Mr. JAVITS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6950, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 142 AND 143

Mr. PROUTY also submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 144 THROUGH 146

Mr. HARTKE submitted three amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 6950, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 147

Mr. PROXMIER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 6950, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 612, known as the Dairy Import Act of 1967, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], and my name be added as cosponsors.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of S. 945, known as the Federal Magistrates Act of 1967, introduced by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] be included as a cosponsor.

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

HEARINGS ON CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I announce for the information of the Senate that open hearings have been scheduled on legislation relating to the authorization of the central Arizona project in Arizona and New Mexico.

The hearings will begin on May 1 and it is expected that they will last at least 3 or 4 days. The hearings will be held

in room 3110 of the New Senate Office Building, beginning at 10 a.m. All those wishing to submit testimony to the committee will be welcome to do so.

HEARINGS ON REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate I would like to announce that on April 17 the Parks and Recreation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will begin 2 days of hearings on legislation to create a Redwood National Park.

Previously, it had been announced that the hearings would begin on April 18. However, it has been necessary to adjust the committee program to begin them on Monday, April 17, at 10 a.m., in room 3110, New Senate Office Building.

All Members of the Senate and other interested citizens and organizations are welcome to submit testimony. Hearings were held last year in the field and in Washington, D.C., and it is hoped that oral presentations will be limited to new information.

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF FEDERAL LAND BANKS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the golden anniversary of the Nation's Federal land banks was observed at Larned, Kans., on March 27.

This occasion marked a momentous milestone in the history of agriculture and its financing. It was a great occasion, and among those in attendance were Gov. Robert Docking, Congressman ROBERT DOLE, Mr. R. B. Tootell, Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, and many outstanding representatives of the Farm Credit Administration from Washington and every section of the Nation.

It was my privilege to introduce the guest speaker for the occasion, our distinguished representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Arthur Goldberg. Ambassador Goldberg, in his down-to-earth manner, won many friends and made a great impression on those in attendance.

The address delivered by Governor Tootell stressed the importance of agriculture in our Nation's economy and also stressed the dependence of agriculture on credit.

I ask unanimous consent that Governor Tootell's address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NEW DIMENSIONS FOR AGRICULTURAL CREDIT
(Address by R. B. Tootell, Governor, Farm Credit Administration, at the 50th anniversary observance of the Federal land banks, Larned, Kans., March 27, 1967)

Ambassador Goldberg, Senator Carlson, Governor Docking, Congressman Dole, distinguished guests and friends. I feel privileged to participate in this celebration commemorating the birth of the Federal land banks and what turned out to be the present complete Farm Credit system. This introduced new dimensions for agricultural credit.

It is a particular delight for me to be here

in Kansas. Having been reared on a Montana homestead, I have a certain nostalgia for rural life and consider myself fortunate to have remained involved in agricultural affairs. Because ours was a dry land farm in the plains country, I understand your concern right now about the moisture problem in this area. I join you Kansans in your hopes for the rains you need so badly. I like these big open spaces that are so free of air pollution. The unobstructed view so often common to the plains country encourages a freedom of both the mind and the spirit.

Your attractive, progressive city of Larned is at the center of the nation's biggest and most important industry—its agriculture.

NATION'S BIGGEST INDUSTRY

Let us look at some of the statistics of our nation's biggest industry. It is still made up of more than three million independent producers, employing between six and seven million workers. This is more than the combined employment in the transportation, public utilities, steel and automobile industries.

The current value of our farmers' assets is some \$273 billion. This is about two-thirds of the value of the current assets of all corporations in the United States. The investment per worker in agriculture is approximately 65 percent more than the investment per worker in manufacturing.

Our farmers are important customers for a great deal of the United States commerce and industry. They currently spend \$30 billion a year on goods and services that enter into their farm production. In addition to this, they spend some \$20 billion a year for goods and services in their role as consumers, part of which comes from non-farm income.

While fewer than 7 percent of our employed people work directly on farms and ranches, more than one-third of our entire labor force is employed in agriculture and agriculturally related business, which in recent years has come to be known as agribusiness. On the input side, there are the great industries that supply farm machinery and equipment; fuel and oil for tractors, trucks and autos; fertilizers and other chemicals used for control of insects, weeds and plant diseases; mixed feeds, animal medicines and a great variety of other production supplies. These have to be manufactured, transported, stored, financed, merchandised and serviced. Examples of agriculture's impact on such industrial centers as Pittsburgh and Detroit exist in the \$5 billion worth of tractors, trucks, farm machinery and related capital items bought by farmers each year. These purchases sustain payrolls and operations of large segments of the steel and farm equipment industries. The products of those industries, in turn, are vital to modern, technological agriculture.

A large number of people also are employed in the marketing of agricultural products. Here transportation, storage, processing, financing and merchandising are essential services that must be rendered to make the products of farm and ranch into the countless items people need for food, clothing, comfort and shelter. This vast combination of enterprises is becoming even more universal, bringing urban and rural interests more closely together in an interdependent whole. It is therefore very important that the significance of agriculture and the problems of agriculture be known and understood by our urban cousins.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF OUR AGRICULTURAL EFFICIENCY

Farmers of the United States are efficient, especially in terms of output per man. Fifty years ago, one farm worker in this country produced food for himself and seven other people; in 1950, one man produced

enough for 15 persons; in 1967, he produces enough to meet the needs of 37. These are average figures, let me remind you, taking into account all farmers and ranchers of the United States. I believe it is quite accurate to say that the better producer, the modern, business-oriented family farmer, produces enough for 50 or 60 other persons.

Less than 7 percent of our total labor force is employed on farms, and this relatively small number produces a super-abundance of food and fiber for ourselves and many other people in the world. No other country has even approached this accomplishment. The Western European countries which are included in the Common Market, and with which our Government is negotiating on agricultural trade terms now, employ something like 25 percent of their labor force in primary agricultural production. For Russia, agriculture is the real bottleneck. More than 40 percent of that country's labor force is tied down on farms that produce only two-thirds as much as our total agricultural output.

For more than a century our people have had the assurance of an abundant supply of cheap food. Some housewives may not agree, but the facts are that each hour of industrial labor purchases more and better food by far than in any other country. Presently only 18 percent of our disposable income is spent for food. In 1929, it took approximately 24 percent of our disposable income for food. Productivity per agricultural worker in the last 10 years has increased on an average of $6\frac{1}{2}$ percent a year, while the productivity of nonagricultural workers has increased at a rate of about 3 percent a year.

Without these two situations—the release of a very high proportion of our people from agricultural production and the availability of abundant, cheap food—we would never have had our great industrial economy. Only as we developed an efficient agriculture were we able also to develop an efficient industrial economy. For proof of this, we need only to look at the situation in the developing countries all over the world. Many still have as much as 80 percent of their people employed as agricultural producers. In many, as much as 80 percent of the individual's annual income is required for food, and this may not buy a diet that is at all adequate by our standards. Belatedly many of these countries are coming to realize that their agricultural development must precede and be kept in balance with their industrial development. No doubt Ambassador Goldberg will develop this point more fully.

HOW DID ALL THIS HAPPEN?

This question is asked by many people when they learn of the miracle of agricultural production in this country. Of course, the answer is that it did not just happen. True, we are blessed with rich land resources and generally with a favorable climate which permits growing a diversity of crops in different parts of the country. I would remind you, however, that the American Indians had these same resources.

Some say that hard work and ingenuity are the basic ingredients; others believe that universal education is the answer (especially involving the contribution of our unique Land-Grant College system). Research is felt by many to be the key to our agricultural successes.

Institutions we have emphasized over the years have undoubtedly played an important role. The institution of the family farm has been a dominant one, emphasized especially by the Homestead Acts which date back more than a hundred years. Cooperatives—voluntary associations of farmer producers—have received a good deal of emphasis and have played an important role. So have agricultural credit institutions.

As we look back at these elements, we must conclude that they and many others have

made major contributions. It is my belief, however, that underlying all of these is the matter of incentives which are basic to our economic and social system. The opportunity for the individual to be an independent proprietor and to benefit from his own ingenuity and efforts is an important part of the explanation.

SPECIALIZED CREDIT FOR FARMERS

We are meeting here today because of the vision and persistence of certain farm leaders soon after the turn of this century. These men were aware of the growing need for credit in agriculture as the frontier disappeared, land prices rose, tenancy increased, and new items of farm equipment became available. For the most part, farmers had access only to credit institutions designed primarily to serve commerce and industry. In tight money periods, shortage of credit in rural areas was particularly acute. The greatest need at the time was for dependable long-term farm mortgage credit on reasonable terms. The typical farm mortgage for that period carried an interest rate of 8 or 10 percent. It was written for 5 years and, if renewed, usually called for a 5 percent commission.

The persistence of these farm leaders paid off when in July 1916, Congress passed the Federal Farm Loan Act creating the 12 Federal land banks, one of which was located at Wichita. The Act also provided that farmer borrowers would organize national farm loan associations (now called Federal land bank associations), through which they might get their loans. We are celebrating today, as you know, the chartering of the first such association in the United States here at Larned, Kansas, 50 years ago. Since their first loan was made here, the land banks have made 2 million loans totaling \$14 billion. Today the 12 banks have nearly 400,000 loans outstanding for an amount exceeding \$5 billion. This is approximately 20 percent of all the farm mortgage business outstanding in the United States.

The Federal land banks served as a pattern for other parts of the cooperative Farm Credit system that Congress created later in response to the special needs of the times. Following the sharp agricultural depression of 1920-21, the 12 Federal intermediate credit banks were created to serve as banks of discount for agricultural credit corporations and certain other agricultural lenders. During the Great Depression the Congress in 1933 made provision for the production credit associations and for the 13 banks for cooperatives, as well as a new supervising agency, the Farm Credit Administration. This rounded out the system designed to render a complete, specialized lending service for United States farmers and their co-operators.

Although the government initially capitalized these lending institutions, the Congress wisely provided that as farmers borrowed from them, they would invest in them and that the government capital would be retired. The Federal land banks have been completely farmer owned for 20 years. Other parts of the system are largely farmer owned as evidenced by the fact that less than 10 percent of the \$1.8 billion net worth of the system is now represented by government capital. The system is highly decentralized with control largely with farmer elected boards of directors at the association and district bank level.

Loan funds for the Farm Credit banks come from sale of their own bonds to the investing public rather than from appropriations from Congress. Independent access to the money market is a basic strength of the system, and is the only way it can equate loan funds with the sound business needs of farmers.

Although the Congress created these banks and associations in times of emergency, it did not create them as emergency or gap-

filling institutions. Rather it established them as permanent cooperative institutions—a part of the competitive, free enterprise system. They are comparable to farm supply cooperatives that make available necessary production inputs.

EVALUATION—50 YEARS OF COOPERATIVE CREDIT

It seems to me appropriate that I undertake some evaluation of this system ushered in by the Federal land banks 50 years ago. Their greatest lasting contribution, I am convinced, is the establishment of a mechanism by which farmers from all parts of the United States pool their collateral and market it efficiently. The land banks thus established a means for overcoming the traditional acute credit shortage in rural areas.

The most spectacular service of the land banks was their refinancing of farm mortgages during the Great Depression, when tax delinquencies and farm foreclosures were rampant. In the three most active years of this program, 1933-36, the land banks received applications on nearly one-half of all the mortgaged farms in the United States. They made 760,000 loans totaling about \$2 billion.

Innovations have been many. Pioneering of the long-term, amortized real estate loan and enlightened loan servicing policies have been some of the other outstanding contributions. Other successful lenders have adopted these innovations.

The Federal land banks and their sister institutions have made direct contributions by successfully lending farmers and their cooperatives nearly \$86 billion in the last 50 years. I am convinced, however, that their indirect contributions have been even greater. Nearly every farmer in the country who has used credit since 1917 has benefited by the presence of these specialized agricultural lending institutions that have a significant effect upon loan terms. The end result has been dependable credit suited to the needs of farmers. This has enabled the timely adoption of technical advances that made farmers miracle producers, and a real boon to consumers here and in foreign lands.

The availability of dependable credit, suited to the needs of farmers, has been a very important factor in keeping control of farming in the hands of independent farmers. Only 17 percent of our farms today are tenant operated; and approximately 95 percent are still family farms in which the family has a substantial investment, makes the management decisions, and performs most of the labor. I am sure your Senator Carlson, who is so interested in the welfare of agriculture, shares my view about the importance of keeping control of farming with independent farm families.

WHAT OF THE FUTURE

Despite the steady decline in the total number of farms and the downtrends in both farm population and farm employment, United States agriculture is definitely a growth industry. In the years ahead, agricultural output will be increased to meet the needs of an expanding population here at home as well as increased demands for food exports. It is a safe assumption that agricultural production will be increased by at least 25 percent in the next decade. Most experts foresee an increase of 65 percent in the population of the United States by the close of the century—130 million more people in less than 35 years.

This presents a great challenge to the farmers of the future, especially as we approach the limits of land suited for crop production. Agriculture, like other fields of modern enterprise, has its quota of ingenuity and pioneering spirits willing to test new ideas. There is bound to be more specialization in crops and livestock, more land improvement including irrigation and greater use of fertilizer along with more effective

pest control and more productive crop varieties. Further innovations of farm equipment are a certainty. Successful operation of the farm of the future will require management ability of a high order.

The farm of the future will have even larger capital requirements. Credit will play an increasingly important role, being relied on for much of the capital investment and for most of the annual operating costs. Both borrowers and lenders will need to have more precise information, and do more long-term planning as well as annual budgeting. No doubt, the service of electronic computers will be made conveniently available to farmers and adapted to their special needs. Many agricultural lenders are likely to make this service available.

I have confidence that the land banks and Farm Credit system generally will be in the forefront of the exciting changes bound to come. They introduced new dimensions for agricultural credit in 1917; they developed further new dimensions during the 50 years that followed; and I am sure they will develop still newer dimensions that will be needed in the years ahead. Fifty years ago here at Larned the Federal land banks started working for United States farmers, and they have been marching down the road together ever since. The entire nation has just cause to express gratitude to those who have contributed to the pioneering, pace-setting efforts of our system: officials of the land banks, association managers and their staffs, and personnel of the Farm Credit Administration.

Most of all, this is a time of tribute to the farmer-member-borrowers, and particularly to directors of local associations, the 12 Farm Credit districts, and members of the Federal Farm Credit Board. This golden anniversary is rightfully dedicated to America's farmers, "Providers of Plenty." Through efforts exemplified by the members and many of the system's leaders present in this room today, may agriculture move forward to even greater heights of achievement under the control of independent farm families! It will then justify a similar dedicatory slogan at the centennial celebration of the Federal land banks in 2017!

FARMERS RESTIVE BECAUSE OF DECLINE IN INCOME

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the continued decline in farm income is causing great unrest among the farmers of this Nation and has a serious effect on our Nation's economy.

Prices of farm products dipped 1 percent in the month that ended March 15. The Department of Agriculture reports that farm prices are now 7 percent below those of March last year and almost 21 percent below the high reached in 1951.

At the same time, prices that farmers have to pay for manufactured goods rose last month, so that they are now 3 percent higher than a year ago.

In other words, with farm parity at 73, the farmer is now forced to buy his machinery, pay for his labor, and pay his taxes at the lowest parity for 30 years. Not only justified is the farm unrest, but also every effort must be made to secure for the American farmer his fair share of the national income.

I ask unanimous consent that a resolution I received from the Sedgwick County Farmers Union be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SEDGWICK COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
Andale, Kans., March 16, 1967.

Senator FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: At the regular county meeting of the Sedgwick County Farmers Union on March 7, 1967, the following resolution was adopted.

Whereas the farmer is in a continuous and progressive squeeze between the cost of production and the price on the market of his products, and

Whereas the supply of wheat and feed grains has been reduced to below safe reserves, and

Whereas the price has been apparently depressed by artificial means, and

Whereas this situation forces the farmer to subsidize the home consumer, the foreign market, and in fact State Dept. foreign policy;

Be it resolved, That the President use the power of the Executive office, and Congress use their power to legislate, and the Dept. of Agriculture use means already available to raise farm prices particular to provide certificates of 65¢ per bushel for wheat going to export.

Be it further resolved, That in the event immediate remedial efforts are not forthcoming, the members of Sedg. Co. F.U. pledge support of the movement to plow wheat sowed on the additional acres allotted in 1967.

GREGORY BLICK,
President.
WILFRED BERGMAMP,
Vice President.
JOHN THOME, Secretary.

SENATOR METCALF CALLS FOR RESIGNATION OF CHARLES LUCE

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, Mr. Charles Luce came to the position of Under Secretary of the Interior after he had done a superb job as Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration. His integrity is beyond question. He is competent to run any electric system in the Nation.

Recently it was announced that Mr. Luce had accepted a position as head of Consolidated Edison, an announcement which he confirmed at a press conference in New York last week. Mr. Luce will bring to that company rare skills, demonstrated ability, and a completely new perspective.

Mr. Luce has made his decision to leave the public service for private industry. But he remains in his public position. This is a time of changing loyalties for him. In his present office he is responsible for shaping public policy in areas in which the commercial utilities have a tremendous stake, such as who shall develop the public deposits of oil shale.

More directly, the company which Mr. Luce will head is a party to the arrogant proposal, announced recently by the Governor of New York on behalf of the investor-owned utilities in his State, to exclude city-owned and customer-owned power systems from an \$8 billion nuclear generation and expansion system. Fortunately, the New York Legislature, before adjourning yesterday, declined to approve legislation to facilitate that proposition.

As I told Attorney General Clark last week, in my request that he investigate the antitrust aspects of this exclusive arrangement:

If the public systems are unable to obtain cheap wholesale power and adequate transmission, from either the Federal government or the giant investor-owned systems, the public systems which serve about 20 per cent of the customers will be forced to raise their rates or sell out to the giants of the industry. Competition, the yardstick which the public systems have offered through the years, and which has been much more helpful than regulation in keeping rates in line, will be decreased, if not altogether eliminated, our pluralistic power system will have become completely monopolistic, at the expense of the ratepayer.

As Under Secretary of Interior, Mr. Luce is charged with assisting the Secretary discharge his duties, which include supervision of the Defense Electric Power Administration.

That Administration—

And I quote from page 249 of the 1966-67 U.S. Government Organization Manual—

serves as the focal point of the contact with the electric power industry for other Government agencies in the preparation of civil defense preparedness plans, State and local government civil defense plan, vulnerability studies and allied activities. It maintains continuing surveillance of the generating and transmission capabilities of the electric power industry.

Mr. President, it is impossible for any person to prepare the Nation for an adequate power system while also preparing to exclude a vital portion of our pluralistic electric power from participation in meeting future needs.

Mr. Luce cannot serve two masters. As an honorable man, his only alternative is to resign immediately.

THE MEANING OF THE COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM TO THE NORTHERN CHEYENNES

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the Morning Star News is a publication of the Northern Cheyenne Indian Tribe. In the March 1967 issue, the lead item is entitled "Comments from the President's Desk," by John Woodenlegs, president of the Northern Cheyenne Tribal Council. Here in the words of one of America's outstanding Indian leaders is a description of what the community action program under the Office of Economic Opportunity has meant to the Northern Cheyennes:

During February we held a District meeting in Lame Deer, Ashland, Busby and Birney. We needed to have two people from each district picked to serve on an advisory committee: Lame Deer—Frank Walks Last, Annie Shoulderblade, Jean Lone Bear (alternate); Rosebud—Wayne Littlewhiteman, Elizabeth Elliot, Belle Highwalking (alternate); Ashland—William Parker, Ruby Braine, Eldora Bement (alternate); Busby—Martin Roundstone, Sr., Lenora Wolfname, Jean Risingsun (alternate); Birney—Raphael Big Left Hand, Dora Bellymule, Mrs. Joseph Sandcrane (alternate).

The Cheyennes are in their second year of the Community Action Program under the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO). We were the first Montana Indians to get a Community Action Program. We have received more money than any other group of Indians in our state.

How did we start our program? Early in 1965, The Association on American Indian Affairs offered to help the council. They sent

a lawyer from Washington, D.C. to explain the bill to us. The council discussed ideas for all kinds of programs and held district meetings and asked the people what they wanted.

The council used lots of help writing up the program to send to Washington; Eastern Montana College; Montana State University at Bozeman; The Association on American Indian Affairs; the Public Health Service; the Bureau of Indian Affairs; Montana State Employment Service and others.

These programs we have are good. They try to help our people to help themselves. Maybe it would help to talk about these programs a little, even if we do know something about them already.

Head Start is to help get our little children ready for school.

Remedial Reading is to help all our children who are behind in reading to catch up.

Health Workers try to help all our people to improve their health.

Upward Bound is to help high school students get ready for college by going to a special summer school program at Eastern Montana College in Billings, Montana.

Adult Education Classes are available to teach, adults whatever they want—reading, English, arithmetic, typing, learning how to manage our money better. What you people want to know—we have teachers who can help.

Neighborhood Youth Corps is to help our young people learn to be good workers on the job. It is not part of the Community Action Program, but cooperates with it.

Now—if we want to get as much as we can out of these programs, we have to make a lot of effort, too. Parents should do all they can to encourage their children.

Be willing to visit Head Start classes; be willing to learn useful things the teachers may tell you—to help you help your child.

Be willing to help your child in school by encouraging him to read at home. See that he gets his homework done. Turn off the TV and give him one place where he can sit and do his work. We even have a library in Lame Deer now where you can borrow books. Some of the schools have libraries for the children.

The Health Workers want to give you information that will help you to stay healthy—and help you to get well if you are sick. Try to cooperate with them and see if this does help you.

If you have a teenager in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, tell him or her to learn all they can. Encourage them to be a good worker who does a job the way it is supposed to be done. Encourage them to get there on time, every time—and to feel proud to do a job well. This is important. Some day they may depend on a job for their living. The NYC program is aimed at teaching our youth how to be good workers. As parents you can get behind your teenager and help, too. If you don't care what they do, then they probably won't care much either.

The Upward Bound program is to encourage teenagers to go to college. The summer of 1965, thirty-six Cheyennes went. The summer of 1966, only fifteen went. We could have sent thirty. This program really helps students. It gives them an idea of what college is like.

It is discouraging we lost the chance to send all thirty last summer. If you have a teenager who gets a chance to go this summer—really encourage him to go. Even if he might rather stay home and work—this program will help him more in the long run. If he does go to college later he will get a good education which will help him all his life.

Can we see that these programs are good opportunities? Can we all use them, get into them, get behind them, take advantage of this chance to learn while we have it? OEO may have a hard time in Congress get-

ting money year after year. That's why it's so important that we Cheyennes use these programs now while we do have them. Learn all we can. Help ourselves get going. Later—may be too late.

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE POSES NO THREAT TO UNITED STATES ON HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS—XLV

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the fright peddlers are busy again in their fight to stop the Senate from ratifying the human rights conventions. Not content to wrestle with real issues or real-life foes, these contemporary vigilantes are now conjuring up utterly baseless prophecies of American citizens being dragged before the International Court of Justice for violations of the human rights conventions and then banished to a dank cell in some unnamed police state.

Facts neither distract nor discourage these ever-alert zealots. The fact that all members of the United Nations are automatically parties to the statute of the International Court is ignored. The fact that the International Court of Justice can merely render a decision and can neither impose nor execute a judgment is never mentioned.

The fact that only a state—a national government—and not individual citizens—can be a party to a case before the International Court is conveniently forgotten.

Also, Mr. President, they fail to state the fact that the United States is already a party to 22 multilateral treaties and 22 bilateral treaties—a total of 44 international agreements—all of which provide for the submission of disputes to the International Court of Justice.

I have seen no erosion of our national sovereignty as a result of these 44 treaties and I doubt whether any Member of this body has.

I cannot foresee the remotest threat to our sovereignty through Senate ratification of human rights conventions on forced labor, genocide, political rights of women, and slavery. All of the practices proscribed by these conventions are anathema to our entire American law and whole American tradition.

The "International Court of Justice myth" is no basis for the Senate's failure to ratify these conventions. Submission of disputes to the International Court did not prevent our ratifying treaties on road traffic, poppy plants, or oil pollution of the sea.

It most certainly should be no obstacle to our ratifying these four conventions on forced labor, genocide, political rights of women, and slavery.

BANK SUPPORT FOR TRUTH IN LENDING CONTINUES TO GROW

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I recently received a letter from Mr. Raymond K. Smith, president of the First National Bank & Trust Co. of Corning, N.Y. Mr. Smith was kind enough to send me a copy of the 1966 annual report of the First National Bank. In the section on consumer credit the First National Bank strongly endorses the

truth-in-lending bill and believes a statement of the true annual rate of interest will provide borrowers with much needed information.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the section of the bank's report on consumer credit be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONSUMER CREDIT LOANS

Although its Consumer Credit loans showed a substantial increase in 1966, your bank made consistent effort throughout the year to educate customers in the prudent use of credit, especially when financing new automobiles and appliances. There is still no appreciable public understanding of the difference between direct and indirect financing, as well as the true cost of "time payment" instalment financing when expressed in terms of annual interest.

To help prevent abuses in consumer credit, the New York State Retail Instalment Loan Act was enacted several years ago. However, in actual practice this law has contributed to higher interest costs for instalment purchases made under the 'Indirect' or 'Dealer Method' of financing. All such loans, in addition to yielding interest for the cooperating financial institution, also earn approximately one-fifth of this amount for the dealer making the original sale. In other words, part of the higher interest charged goes to the dealer as a "kickback."

Thus, dealer-originated loans which are sold to a cooperating bank or finance company can carry finance charges as high as 24%. Not only has it become common practice in the automobile and appliance industries for dealers to receive a portion of such finance charges, in many cases banks themselves are encouraging the buying public to finance purchases through dealers, despite the higher costs involved.

Your bank supports and endorses the "Truth in Lending" legislation which has been before the Congress for several years. This proposed legislation requires that the borrower be fully informed of the total cost of credit transactions expressed in a true annual rate of interest. Only in this way can abuses in instalment financing be eliminated.

WISCONSIN EDUCATORS KILLED IN TRAGIC VIETNAM PLANE CRASH

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on March 23 three Wisconsin educators died fighting the other war in Vietnam—the war against ignorance and poverty. These men went to Vietnam to help the people of that embattled land to improve their colleges and universities. They were part of a group of seven, all of whom were killed in a tragic plane crash.

The acts of military heroism we read about daily in our newspapers tend to obscure the dedication of the many public-spirited Americans who are working to lead the Vietnamese people into an era of greater prosperity. It is sad that we recognize their contribution only in death.

However, let this tragedy be a reminder to the Congress that we must provide the wherewithal for the other war if military victories are to become truly lasting national achievements.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement made by AID Administrator Gaud as well as brief biographies of the seven educators be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY WILLIAM S. GAUD, ADMINISTRATOR, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, ON THE FATAL PLANE CRASH IN VIETNAM

The fatal plane crash in Vietnam is a great tragedy.

Seven distinguished educators and Bob LaFollette, an AID staff man accompanying them, have lost their lives. Their colleagues in the educational community and in the U.S. foreign assistance program mourn their deaths.

These men were in Vietnam to help the people of that embattled country improve their colleges and universities, there to share their knowledge and experience with a small nation which is struggling to assure its people a better future. They represent the best in America.

On behalf of the U.S. Agency for International Development, I extend the deepest sympathy to the families of the victims.

FOR FRONT LINES

AID Education Advisor Dr. Robert R. LaFollette and seven prominent U.S. educators were killed in Vietnam March 23 when their plane crashed into a mountain north of Danang during a monsoon rainstorm. The Air America pilot was also killed.

The education team, including two college presidents, was in Vietnam under an AID contract to survey the country's higher education program and draw up a plan for its future development. Begun early in January, the study was to have been completed April 1.

At the time of their death, the educators were traveling from Saigon to visit the university at Hue, 400 miles to the north. The pilot made an unscheduled landing at Danang because of bad weather and later decided to complete the final leg of the trip.

Crash victims were:

Dr. Robert R. LaFollette, 72, a former history professor who joined AID in 1962 as a higher education advisor in Ethiopia.

Dr. James Albertson, 41, President of Wisconsin State University's Stevens Point branch and team director.

Dr. Harry F. Bangsberg, 39, President of Bemidji State College in Minnesota.

Dr. A. Donald Beattie, 45, Dean of the School of Business and Economics at the Whitewater branch of Wisconsin State University.

Dr. Vincent F. Conroy, 44, Director of Field Studies at Harvard's Center for Educational Research.

Dr. Howard G. Johnshoy, 48, Dean of Academic Affairs at Gustavus Adolphus College in St. Peter, Minn.

Dr. Arthur D. Pickett, 51, professor of biological sciences and Director of the Honors Program at the University of Illinois in Chicago.

Dr. Melvin L. Wall, 54, head of the Department of Plant and Earth Sciences at Wisconsin State University at River Falls.

Their bodies are being returned to the United States for burial.

Team members left behind a complete first draft of their proposed survey report with the AID mission in Saigon, and their recommendations are still expected to have an impact on the future of higher education in Vietnam.

NORTH VIETNAM AIRFIELDS—THE CASE FOR THE PILOT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on three trips to the Far East in the last 16 months, I was briefed on Air Force and naval airpower by U.S. civilian and military leaders at Cincpac Headquarters

in Hawaii, and also in the Vietnam theater.

These officials, along with many of us back in this country, believe that successful air attacks against the airfields of North Vietnam would not only lessen the North Vietnamese capacity for aggression, but would also reduce the number of lost American flyers.

Others back here, however, both in and out of the Government, do not agree.

The latter maintain that, since the Migs of the enemy are reported to have shot down only 10 of our aircraft in the past 2 years, they are not enough of a threat to justify our pilots attacking the airfields in question.

The truth, however, is well expressed in the words of one fighter pilot with whom I talked last December. He summed up the present air defense system of the North Vietnamese as "integrated, sophisticated, coordinated, and improving."

North Vietnam Mig-21's are now a formidable part of the air defense system to which this U.S. pilot referred. They are mach 2 fighters, with both cannons and air-to-air missiles, and currently operate all the way from the deck to altitudes well above those which can be attained by our own fighters.

Coordinated with the high performance of these Soviet-built planes are the Russian SAM-2 surface-to-air supersonic guided missiles. The latter are effective from 5,000 feet up to U-2 altitudes.

The third component part of this increasingly sophisticated North Vietnamese defense system is composed of anti-aircraft artillery—AAA—guns. They in turn are effective from close to the ground up to 40,000 feet. Added to these are the hundreds of thousands of light automatic weapons and small arms now located throughout North Vietnam.

The fourth element, one which ties together the capabilities of the above-mentioned weapons systems, is the large network of North Vietnamese air defense radars. This network includes many radar command and control centers. Each of the latter could handle the coordinated direction and control of the anti-aircraft weapons, the surface-to-air missiles, and the Mig fighters.

These hundreds of radar stations constitute "eyes" for the thousands of medium and heavy anti-aircraft guns; and also for the many surface-to-air missile battalions that currently launch missiles from camouflaged sites.

The manner in which the total capabilities of these weapons systems are presently coordinated by the North Vietnamese has resulted in the loss of over 500 of our aircraft; and what is more important, hundreds of our flyers.

On days of good weather, incoming missiles and flak bursts from anti-aircraft batteries can be spotted; but in order to penetrate enemy defenses, our planes must fly in at dangerously low altitudes.

Migs launched from any of the North Vietnamese airfields then attempt to shoot down our own heavily laden and less maneuverable aircraft; or at least force them to jettison their ordnance in effort to avoid being destroyed.

Some people back in this country apparently believe that these Migs are a relatively unimportant part of the North Vietnamese overall air defense. But scores of U.S. pilots operating over North Vietnam last December emphasized to me that this is just not true.

These pilots pointed out that, in order to avoid the Migs, they were forced to fly at lowest altitudes—lower even than the heights required to evade SAM's and the radar-directed anti-aircraft.

They also emphasized that late-model Mig interceptors can outmaneuver, outclimb, outaccelerate, and even outrun our own fighters at higher altitudes.

Accordingly, without firing a shot or launching a missile, said Migs force our own airmen to literally fly into "walls" of barrage fire which come from an unprecedented concentration of automatic weapons and small arms; and the point which should be driven home to those who denigrate Mig performance is that this is the fire which has accounted for the bulk of our plane losses to date.

Another significant aspect: U.S. airmen are dedicated professionals, trained to press on to the target regardless; men who can only accept with deep regret the failure of a mission caused by the necessity to jettison their weapons in order to survive.

With the improving skill of the Mig pilots, coordinated with the growing sophistication of their overall defense system, it is inevitable that more of our strike missions will be ineffective, either because our pilots jettison their armaments in effort to live, or are shot down.

As an aside, many pilots felt certain that the jettisoning of their weapons, along with the ultimate explosion on the ground of unsuccessful North Vietnamese ground-to-air SAM's, were both responsible for criticism about attacks on civilian areas.

It is possible that, because of increasingly concentrated North Vietnamese airfield defenses, we will lose more planes if authority were given U.S. pilots to neutralize the five Mig bases in North Vietnam. Nevertheless, our flyers are anxious to obtain that authority, because experience has already shown that when the Migs are up, as many as one-fourth of our strike aircraft can be forced to jettison their weapons so as to get home.

Once these North Vietnamese airfields have been made inoperative, our strikes would automatically become more effective. The fighter pilot now forced to constantly check his "6 o'clock"—direct rear—position for possible enemy fighter attacks on his way to target could then devote all his attention to the successful accomplishment of his mission.

This unique restraint on military targets is justified—as one of the justifications—by claiming that, if the United States took out these Mig airfields, North Vietnamese air operations would move north to bases in China. On our most recent trip to Vietnam, however, we were told that North Vietnamese planes are already using Chinese airfields when it was to their advantage to do so.

In addition, if the North Vietnamese airfields were taken out, North Vietnamese air attacks against our pilots could not be nearly as effective, because

the Mig-21, a day interceptor, has a relatively short range—example, their flying time over Hanoi would be cut in half.

Finally, in all my trips to the Far East, I have never found a single member of the State Department, or the Central Intelligence Agency, or the military who believed that any type or amount of air attacks on North Vietnam would bring in Communist Chinese ground forces. The reverse is true as to what they thought would happen if we put ground troops in the Hanoi-Haiphong area.

The above facts are presented to the Senate after conversations which I have had with over 100 U.S. pilots stationed in Thailand and South Vietnam and who have been participating in attacks on North Vietnam.

If there is any further questioning of the accuracy of their reports on this aspect of the present war, I will recommend to the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee that a few of these pilots be called to testify before that committee. There could be no better way to obtain the truth about the air war now being carried on over North Vietnam.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield for a question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am happy to yield to the able Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PEARSON. I note from the newscasts of the past 3 or 4 days that the Air Force has been given the go ahead to knock out an airfield under construction but is not allowed to knock out those already completed where aircraft are now located.

Does the Senator from Missouri understand the distinction in that decision?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not.

Mr. PEARSON. Neither do I. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE ACT OF 1967

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 81, Senate bill 623.

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

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 623) to give the consent of Congress to the construction of certain international bridges.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "International Bridge Act of 1967".

SEC. 2. The consent of Congress is hereby granted to the construction, maintenance, and operation of any bridge and approaches thereto, which will connect the United States with any foreign country (hereinafter re-

ferred to as an "international bridge"), and to the collection of tolls for its use, so far as the United States has jurisdiction. Such consent shall be subject to (1) the approval of the proper authorities in the foreign country concerned; (2) commitment by the State in which the bridge would be located to review the detailed plans and specifications for the bridge with respect to structural soundness and to inspect the bridge on completion and periodically thereafter; and (3) the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 23, 1906 (33 U.S.C. 491-498), except for section 6 (33 U.S.C. 496), and (4) the provisions of this Act which follow hereafter.

SEC. 3. No bridge may be constructed, maintained, and operated pursuant to section 2 unless the President has first given his approval thereto. In the course of determining whether to grant such approval, the President shall secure the advice and recommendations of (1) the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, in the case of a bridge connecting the United States and Mexico, (2) the Governor of the State in which the bridge would be located, and (3) the heads of such departments and agencies of the Federal Government as he deems appropriate.

SEC. 4. The approval of the Secretary of the Army, as required by section 1 of the Act of March 23, 1906 (33 U.S.C. 491) shall only be given subsequent to the President's approval, as provided for in section 3 of this Act, and shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge is commenced within two years and completed within five years from the date of the Secretary's approval: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary may, for good cause shown, extend for a reasonable time either or both of the time limits herein provided.

SEC. 5. If tolls are charged for the use of an international bridge constructed under this Act, the following provisions shall apply, so far as the United States has jurisdiction—

(a) in the case of a bridge constructed or taken over or acquired by a private individual, company, or other private entity, tolls may be collected for a period not to exceed sixty-six years from the date of completion of such bridge, and at the end of such sixty-six years, such bridge and approaches thereto, if not previously transferred to a public agency pursuant to section 6, shall become the property of the State wherein the United States portion of such bridge is located, and no further compensation shall be deemed to be due such individual, company, or entity; or

(b) in the case of a bridge constructed or taken over or acquired by a State or States or by any municipality or other political subdivision or public agency thereof, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period not to exceed forty years from the date of completing or acquiring the same. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, any such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls.

An accurate record of the amount paid for acquiring the bridge and its approaches, the actual expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 6. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to prevent the individual, corporation, or other entity to which, pursuant to this Act,

authorization has been given to construct, operate, and maintain an international bridge and the approaches thereto, from selling, assigning, or transferring the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this Act to any public agency and any such successor agency is authorized to exercise the rights, powers, and privileges acquired under this section in the same manner as if such rights, powers, and privileges had been granted by this Act directly to such agency: *Provided, however,* That with respect to the collection of tolls the provisions of section 5(b) shall apply.

SEC. 7. The provisions of this Act shall apply only to international bridges the construction of which is approved under such provisions.

SEC. 8. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect, impair, or diminish any right, power, or jurisdiction of the United States over or in regard to any navigable waters or any interstate or foreign commerce.

SEC. 9. The Secretary of the Army shall, at the end of each calendar year, transmit to the Congress a report of all approvals pursuant to this Act during such year.

SEC. 10. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 80), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

MAIN PURPOSE

The purpose of this measure is to give the consent of Congress, subject to a number of conditions, to the construction of certain international bridges so as to make separate authorizations for individual international bridges unnecessary for the most part. In this respect, the bill follows the philosophy of the General Bridge Act of 1946 by which Congress granted consent for the construction, maintenance, and operation of bridges, and approaches thereto over the domestic navigable waters of the United States.

BACKGROUND

The General Bridge Act of 1946 specifically stated that it "shall not be construed to authorize the construction of any bridge which will connect the United States, or any territory or possession of the United States, with any foreign country." Accordingly, each individual proposal to build a bridge across waters between the United States and a foreign country has had to receive separate congressional approval. Since enactment of the General Bridge Act of 1946 almost 80 such measures have been passed by the Congress. With population expanding along the northern and southern borders of the United States, it can be expected that this demand will continue, if not increase.

This factor, together with recently developing local controversies as to the sites of proposed bridges, led the Committee on Foreign Relations to explore other means of authorizing the construction of international bridges. After extensive consultation with the executive departments primarily concerned with questions relating to such international bridges, and at the request of the committee, the language embodied in the pending bill was submitted by the Bureau of the Budget and represents the consolidated views of the executive branch.

WHAT THE BILL DOES

The bill consists largely of the generally applicable provisions of the individual authorizations previously enacted and the act of 1906 entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters" (33 U.S.C. 491-498).

The consent of Congress is granted in sec-

tion 2 to the construction, maintenance, and operation of any bridge and approaches thereto, which will connect the United States with any foreign country, subject to (1) the approval of the proper authorities in the foreign country concerned; (2) a commitment by the State or States having jurisdiction over the bridge location to review the detailed plans and specifications for structural soundness and to inspect the bridge on completion and from time to time thereafter; and (3) the provisions of the 1906 act. Requirements (1) and (3) have been consistently a part of prior international bridge authorizations. The condition set forth in clause (2) has not previously been placed in such legislation but the committee considered it desirable because of the significant international consequences which might flow from the structural failure of an international bridge.

Section 3 of the bill requires the prior approval of the President to the construction, maintenance, and operation of bridges. In determining whether to give such approval, the bill provides that the President shall secure the advice and recommendations of (1) the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, in the case of a bridge leading to Mexico; (2) the Governor of the State in which the bridge would be located; and (3) the heads of such departments and agencies of the Federal Government as he deems appropriate. The committee would expect the Secretary of State to be among those consulted.

It seems appropriate to vest the approval power in the President because the question affects foreign relations and because a large number of Federal agencies have an interest—the Bureau of Public Roads, the Corps of Engineers, the Public Health Service, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Customs Bureau, among others. The President can, of course, and probably will, delegate this authority.

Section 4 follows the pattern of the 1906 Bridge Act and provides that the approval of the Secretary of the Army shall be subsequent to that of the President and shall be null and void unless construction of the bridge is begun within 2 years and completed within 5 years from the date of the Secretary's approval. In view of the planning and construction time necessary for some large projects, the bill includes a proviso that the Secretary may, for good cause shown, extend for a reasonable period either or both of the time limits. The equivalent time limitations in the 1906 Bridge Act are 1 and 3 years and in the individual international authorizations they have varied from that to as much as 3 and 6 years. The 2- and 5-year limit appears reasonable when combined with the discretionary extension authority given the Secretary of the Army.

Section 5 applies to tolls. In the case of a privately constructed or acquired international bridge the authority to collect tolls is limited to 66 years from the date of completion of such bridge. After that the bridge must be operated free of toll. The 66-year limitation has been contained in all international bridge authorizations enacted since 1959.

The bill provides that at the end of the 66-year period the bridge and the approaches thereto, if not previously transferred to a public agency, shall become the property of the State in which the U.S. portion of the bridge is located, and no further compensation shall be deemed to be due to the private owners. It was the committee's belief that, inasmuch as a bridge serves the public convenience, provision should be made for its continuing operation after the private owners no longer could provide such operation and maintenance from funds collected through tolls. The private owners would have been compensated through the privilege of building the bridge and collecting tolls for 66 years.

In the case of a publicly owned and operated international bridge, the tolls shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period not to exceed 40 years from the date of the completion or acquisition of the bridge.

For both publicly and privately owned bridges, the bill further requires that an accurate record of the amount paid for acquiring the bridge and its approaches, the actual expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

The provisions relating to tolls charged for the use of a public international bridge are virtually identical to those contained in the General Bridge Act of 1946 except for the period of time set forth. In the General Bridge Act of 1946, this is set at 30 years. The longer period was recommended by the executive branch in the light of recent bridge bonding experience.

It should also be pointed out that the tolls on private bridges are subject to regulation by the Secretary of the Army under the provisions of 33 U.S.C. 494, which is incorporated in the bill by reference.

Section 6 authorizes individuals, corporations, or other entities which, under the act, have obtained authorization to construct, operate, and maintain an international bridge and approaches to it to sell, assign, or transfer the rights, powers, and privileges conferred upon them to any public agency or international bridge authority or commission. The latter will then be authorized to exercise these rights, powers, and privileges in the same manner as if they had been granted to it directly, except for the collection of tolls where the provisions with respect to publicly owned international bridges will apply. This identical provision has been contained in almost all individual international bridge authorizations for many years.

In order to assure continued congressional surveillance over bridges authorized by this bill, the committee provided in section 9 that the Secretary of the Army at the end of each calendar year report to the Congress on approvals made during that year.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS

If approved by the Senate, this will be the third time that the Senate has passed these identical provisions. In the 88th Congress the House passed them also on the last day of the session with minor amendments but the official papers did not reach the Senate for action before adjournment. During the 89th Congress the bill, in the form of a substitute, was sent to conference but the conferees did not meet.

The committee reiterated the conclusions set forth in its previous reports on this measure:

"In recommending this bill to the Senate, the committee wishes to stress that there are no great departures from precedent involved. Nothing in this bill gives advance consent to compacts or agreements between States and foreign countries or subdivisions thereof for the construction of international bridges. Bridges built under such agreements would continue to be considered ad hoc by the Congress. Nor does the bill deal with toll policy for international bridge authorities or commissions because it is felt that appropriate toll provisions could best be worked out in the context of negotiating compacts or agreements to set up such authorities. The bill is naturally limited in its effect to the territory over which the United States has jurisdiction.

"The authorization contained in the bill is

specific and limited and, the committee stresses, largely drawn from existing law and precedent. The committee believes that it represents a more orderly and better method for dealing with requests for permission to build international bridges than has been available heretofore. Its principal advantage is to relieve Congress of the burden of passing on multiplicity of individual bridges."

To date already, several bills have been introduced in the 90th Congress for approval of individual bridge sites. Hopefully, by passing S. 623 promptly, this question can be disposed of before the end of this Congress.

The committee so recommends.

LOAN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a few days ago I received in the mail a publication of the Yugoslav Information Center, of New York City. The bulletin is dated March 14, 1967. It contains two documents, the first setting forth certain news items describing events in Yugoslavia, the second being a speech made on January 10, 1967, by Vladimir Popovic, a member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, to the Central Committee.

The news bulletin contains a statement which reads as follows:

Belgrade, March 8. Yugoslavia and the United States signed a 109 million new dinar loan agreement here today.

One hundred million in dinars is worth \$8,720,000 in American dollars. I continue to read:

The sum in question came from local currency sales of farm produce brought in from the United States in 1964 under the Food-for-Peace Program and is partly to finance the Belgrade-Bar, Sarajevo-Ploce and Knin-Zadar railways, as well as Rijeka and Potpeć hydro-electric power plants.

The agreement was signed by Tasic, Yugoslav Assistant Federal Secretary of Finance and Elbrick, United States Ambassador to Belgrade.

I stated a moment ago that in the same mail was a copy of a speech delivered by Vladimir Popovic. That speech was delivered on January 10. The loan was executed on March 8, 2 months after the speech was made by the Member of the Communist Presidium of Yugoslavia. I want to read from the speech made by Mr. Popovic. Among other things, he said:

Contemporary international relations are beset by many adverse factors, political interference and pressure, the use of force in some parts of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, and particularly American aggression in Vietnam. . . . Although the present situation still does not constitute an immediate danger to world peace, power politics and pressure in international relations are a constant source of unrest and instability. The war in Vietnam is a particularly vivid case in point. The elementary rights of the Vietnamese people to freedom and independence are being violated, and this is why aggression against the people of Vietnam is widely condemned by freedom-loving humanity, which demands that the people of Vietnam be enabled to attain the legitimate objectives of their struggle.

Further in Popovic's statement we read:

We are therefore striving for the cessation of U.S. aggression and have from the very beginning extended full support to the peo-

ple of Vietnam in the attainment of the objectives of their revolutionary struggle. Considering it possible to end the war in a way that would guarantee the fulfillment of the rights of the Vietnamese people, it is imperative that the U.S. government immediately cease the air attacks on the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, open negotiations with the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam as the leading force of the liberation war and assume the obligation to withdraw its troops from Vietnam.

That is not the end of Popovic's statement. He further states:

Traditional cooperation continues with the countries of Africa and Asia, with a view to devising ways and means of improving the international situation and of extending more effective resistance to neo-colonialist pressure and power politics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 3 more minutes.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I continue to read from Mr. Popovic's statement:

It is only through the policy of coexistence and peace, an integral part of which is the right of every people to struggle for its freedom, independence and equal rights, that the socialist forces may appear as the representatives of the interests of all peoples and win support in every country.

Mr. President, the point I wish to make is the absolute injustice and irony of the Yugoslav Communist government on one day accepting our charitable help, and on the next day figuratively, attacking the United States. Popovic, in his statement, echoed completely the words of Ho Chi Minh. Not one word was uttered by this representative of the Communist government of Yugoslavia that is in any way indicative of an appreciation of the fact that the taxpayers of the United States have provided \$2.5 billion in help to the Yugoslav Communist government.

What do those Communists think of our mentality? The more they slap us in the face, the greater the help we give them. It is not only a question of the \$9 million that I have just mentioned, but ever since 1948 the dollars of American citizens have been poured into Communist Yugoslavia.

We are supposed to be the aggressors. We are supposed to sit down with the Communist National Liberation Front and do the settling in South Vietnam. I simply cannot see their argument, nor would I be at ease unless I took the floor today and condemned that attitude of the Communist government of Yugoslavia.

It still seems to be true, as it has been throughout the last 18 years, that every time we give that government help, within a week or a month they redeclare their devotion to communism and reiterate the alleged injustices the United States is committing against decency throughout the world.

I hope that my words will reach Popovic and Tito and the Yugoslav Government, and that the time will come when the taxpayers of the United States will rise in indignation at giving money annually to a government that is hostile

to the principles of our people and the Government of this country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in yesterday's Washington Post, Secretary General U Thant called for a U.S. cease-fire as a start toward Vietnam peace. The headline of the story read thus: "Thant Calls for U.S. Cease-Fire as Start Toward Viet Peace."

The first paragraph reads as follows:

The United States should unilaterally declare a cease-fire in Vietnam as the first step toward peace, U.N. Secretary General U Thant said today.

I read further excerpts from the story:

Thant said in a statement released today that the impasse in Vietnam can be broken "only if one side or the other shows the wisdom and the courage and the compassion for humanity to take the initiative on the first step—that is to say, by undertaking unilaterally to put the standstill truce into effect, and thereafter to fire only if fired upon.

"The United States, with power and wealth unprecedented in human history, is in a position to take this initiative. I must say in all frankness that I share Sen. Clark's view that the United States can afford to take such a step even though there is an admitted, but in my opinion, limited risk for the United States in doing so."

"So long as the bombing is going on, there will be no talks as far as the North Vietnamese are concerned."

Mr. President, the Secretary General of the United Nations, like Caesar's wife, should be above suspicion. That high office should, of course, be employed to bring about peace in Vietnam. But we have a right, indeed, a duty to expect that any appeals for peace will be issued with the most scrupulous attention to neutrality vis-a-vis the parties involved in Vietnam. One would, therefore, expect that Secretary General U Thant would be most careful in the statements he makes with reference to the war in Vietnam.

Regretfully, it would appear that Mr. U Thant has a distressing tendency to be neutral in favor of the North Vietnam Communist regime. On April 2, for example, Mr. U Thant called on the United States to declare a unilateral ceasefire. The Secretary General said, as quoted in the Washington Sunday Star of April 2, 1967:

So long as the bombing—

Referring to the bombing of North Vietnam—

is going on, there will be no talks as far as the North Vietnamese are concerned.

Americans are entitled to ask whether this is a paraphrase of what Soviet Premier Kosygin said in London on February 8, 1967 and which has since been repeated—with various variations—in the Soviet press and on the Soviet radio since that time. In a speech at a Guildhall luncheon in London which the London Daily Telegraph termed "provocative," Mr. Kosygin "packed in every anti-Western punch in the Russian book." The London Daily Telegraph of February 9, 1967, stated that on Vietnam he called for the unconditional termination of American bombing and all other acts of aggression against the North. This was essential if there were to be any talks between them.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to continue for an additional 5 minutes.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the blunt fact is that the bombings in Vietnam are hurting the North Vietnamese in their aggression against South Vietnam and that the evidence suggests that the bombings are helping to save the lives of American fighting men.

President Johnson, our Commander in Chief, has continued the bombings not because he is a warlike man, but, rather, because he wants to bring the North Vietnamese to the peace table as soon as possible, and, at the same time, keep the casualty rate of Americans as low as is possible. We, as Americans, without distinction as to political party, should ask ourselves whether, if we occupied the terrible responsibility of the office of Chief Executive, we would do less.

We need also to ask ourselves another question: Is it, was it ever intended in the U.N. Charter, for the United Nations to replace the American President and American Congress in safeguarding the national security of this Nation?

A distinguished member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. HENRY M. JACKSON], a specialist in national security affairs, has given a cogent answer to this question. Said he, in an article entitled "The Will To Stay the Course," published in the Air Force magazine of January 1966:

The cliché that the United Nations is the keystone of American foreign policy is misleading. The correct statement is that the United States itself is the keystone of American foreign policy: our strength, our sense of purpose, the appeal of our conception of a decent world to the conscience of mankind, and, perhaps most of all, the will which those in charge maintain and communicate to the American people.

Mr. U Thant has departed from the traditional and proper role of the Secretary General of the U.N. His most recent statement certainly does not compare with the careful statements made by Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld during his tenure as Secretary General. As a diplomat, Mr. U Thant should recall the wise words of Sir Winston Churchill that

there is wisdom in negotiating in international affairs, but only in negotiating from strength. A unilateral cessation of bombing—or any other unilateral act in the Vietnam war—on the part of the United States will, as the lessons of the Korean war taught us, not bring peace. Instead, by proving that aggression may pay, it will prolong the agony that all of us wish to end as speedily as is consistent with the word we have pledged to the people of South Vietnam: that we will not hand them over to Communist force.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article to which I have referred. It is entitled "Thant Calls for U.S. Cease-Fire as Start Toward Viet Peace" and was published in the Washington Post of yesterday.

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

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 2, 1967]

THANT CALLS FOR U.S. CEASE-FIRE AS START TOWARD VIET PEACE—SUPPORTS UNILATERAL ACTION PROPOSED BY SENATOR CLARK

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., April 1.—The United States should unilaterally declare a cease-fire in Vietnam as the first step toward peace, U.N. Secretary General U Thant said today.

Thant endorsed a similar proposal made by Sen. Joseph S. Clark (D-Pa.) in Washington yesterday at the opening of the convention of the Americans for Democratic Action.

MAKES EXCEPTION

The Secretary General told newsmen he customarily refrains from commenting on statements by Government officials, but was making an exception this time because he had "been so greatly impressed" by Clark's speech.

Clark told ADA delegates that the United States should, on April 15, stop bombing North Vietnam, halt all offensive operations in South Vietnam and induce South Vietnamese military forces to do the same.

Clark said that Thant, the co-chairman of the 1954 Geneva Conference and members of the International Control Commission should then be able to persuade the North Vietnamese and Vietcong to stop fighting. He expressed confidence that "under these proposals we would soon be at the conference table, with the shooting war stopped."

URGES STANDSTILL

Thant said in a statement released today that the impasse in Vietnam can be broken "only if one side or the other shows the wisdom and the courage and the compassion for humanity to take the initiative on the first step—that is to say, by undertaking unilaterally to put the standstill truce into effect, and thereafter to fire only if fired upon."

"The United States, with power and wealth unprecedented in human history, is in a position to take this initiative. I must say in all frankness that I share Sen. Clark's view that the United States can afford to take such a step even though there is an admitted, but in my opinion, limited risk for the United States in doing so."

[In Washington, the State Department said it had no immediate comment on Thant's statement].

Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg, head of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations, said the United States stands by its earlier reply to Thant's call for a standstill truce, with talks between Washington and Hanoi to be followed by reconvening the Geneva Conference.

"We have been informed that the Secretary General's statement today is neither a proposal nor an appeal," Goldberg said. "We have already responded affirmatively to

the Secretary General's latest proposal contained in his aide memoire of March 14."

Both the United States and South Vietnam have accepted Thant's three-stage plan, but Washington wanted talks on details of the truce to precede the cease-fire. South Vietnam expressed willingness to meet with North Vietnamese representatives, but made no mention of Washington-Hanoi talks or of meeting with the Vietcong.

Thant told newsmen today preliminary discussions of truce details "were out of the question."

"So long as the bombing is going on, there will be no talks as far as the North Vietnamese are concerned," he said. Thant had said Wednesday he had received a written reply from Hanoi to his latest peace plan, but did not hint at its content until today.

Thant is believed to have broached his three-part proposal to North Vietnamese representatives at a meeting early last month in Rangoon, when he visited his native Burma. Their response reportedly was not favorable then, but Thant maintained there had been no outright rejection.

Thant made his proposal for a standstill truce and talks between Washington and Hanoi after failing to win agreement on his 13-month-old plan that called for an end to U.S. bombing of North Vietnam, scaling down military activities on both sides in South Vietnam and discussions among all the participants, including the Vietcong.

VIETNAM MYTHS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, one of the myths implanted in the minds of many Americans is that thousands of Vietnamese children have been horribly burned by U.S. napalm.

This is just a myth is factually related by the eminent New York Times medical columnist, Dr. Howard Rusk, who is also chairman of the department of rehabilitation of New York University's College of Medicine.

In a tour of Vietnam, as related in the New York Times of March 12, Dr. Rusk was unable to turn up a single case of a child burned by napalm. This is what Dr. Rusk said:

To many Americans, Vietnam is a distant and devastated country filled with children who have been burned by American napalm bombs.

This picture simply is not true.

In fact, Dr. Rusk takes dead aim at the Vietcong for continually using terror tactics against civilians.

Mr. President, I think this article, entitled "Reports of Many Children Burned by American Napalm Are Challenged," merits reading, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent that two articles from the current issue of Time magazine also be placed in the RECORD: One relates to the article by Dr. Rusk, the other sums up the findings of the respected London Economist which effectively counter another myth: that U.S. bombers are indiscriminately killing South Vietnamese civilians.

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

[From the New York Times, Mar. 12, 1967]

VIETNAM TOUR: I—REPORTS OF MANY CHILDREN BURNED BY AMERICAN NAPALM ARE CHALLENGED

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, March 9.—For the last week this writer has been on an in-

tensive tour of 20 Vietnamese civilian hospitals from the 17th Parallel in the North to the Gulf of Siam in the South.

The facilities visited ranged from an isolated dispensary serving the Montagnards in the highlands to large provincial civilian hospitals in the hottest combat areas.

To many Americans, Vietnam is a distant and devastated country filled with children who have been burned by American napalm bombs.

This picture simply is not true.

The very nature of the fighting in Vietnam has made civilian casualties inevitable.

From the beginning of the struggle, the Vietcong have continuously used terror tactics against civilians.

As the military activities have become intensified the Vietcong have deliberately wiped out villages and mined busy roads.

CAUGHT IN CROSSFIRE

More and more civilians have been inadvertently caught in the crossfire despite the very stringent precautions taken by the United States and Allied forces.

Not even partial statistics on the number of civilian casualties were available until last November when the first nationwide hospital survey was held.

Monthly surveys since indicate that, nationwide, approximately 15 per cent of all hospital admissions are war casualties. The remaining 85 per cent are for diseases and accidents.

Certainly there are burned children and adults in Vietnam.

This writer personally saw every burn case in the 20 hospitals he visited. Among them was not a single case of burns due to napalm and but two from phosphorus shells.

There have been cases of severe burns from napalm but the numbers are not large in comparison to burns due to accidents.

Of the scores of American physicians queried many had not seen a single case of burns due to napalm and others had seen but a single case. For every case of burns resulting from war there are scores of cases of burns resulting from gasoline.

Because of inflation the cost of fuel for cooking is very high. As a result, many Vietnamese farmers and villagers pilfer or buy stolen gasoline. They are inexperienced in its use and try to use it like kerosene. The results are tragic.

A TYPICAL EXAMPLE

The percentage of war casualties in the population of a given hospital depends upon the intensity of military action in that area.

The provincial hospital at Danang is a typical example. This is a 300-bed surgical hospital that had 700 patients at the time of the visit.

The bulk of the surgical care is given by a 26-member team of American physicians, nurses and technicians.

The hospital was particularly busy that morning as the prior weekend the Vietcong had used for the first time their largest mortars of the war, a Russian-made 140-mm. rocket, in an attack of the Danang air base. They missed the base but hit the nearby village of Apdo.

Thirty-two civilians were killed and 60 patients from this one attack had been admitted to the hospital. Most had multiple compound fractures.

The same weekend, a Vietnamese bus had hit a Vietcong land mine, causing 50 additional hospital admissions.

The latter is an almost daily occurrence in this war-torn country.

For the month of February the medical and surgical hospitals in Danang had 1,661 admissions of whom 468 were war casualties.

Of these, 248 were presumed to have been caused by the Vietcong since they resulted from grenades, mortars, mines and booby traps, which are used by the Vietcong.

Seventy-four of the casualties were pre-

sumed to have been caused by United States, Vietnamese and allied action since they resulted from bombings, air strikes and artillery.

Small arms fire, which could have originated from either side, caused the remaining 146 casualties.

At a visit farther south the next day the picture was somewhat different as United States, Vietnamese and allied troops were on the offensive.

The city was Quinohn, where the 400-bed hospital was being aided by a medical team from New Zealand. The hospital had 600 patients for its 400 beds.

One-third, or 200, were casualties. Here the figures were reversed.

For the month of February, the Vietcong were presumed to have caused 59 casualties and the allies 102 with the remainder of undetermined origin. Significantly, however, of the 200 casualties only 20 were children.

The next day among the stops was the resort city of Dalat, the former summer capital, in a mountain setting reminiscent of North Carolina.

Since there has been no fighting in Dalat, traditionally, there was not a single casualty in the hospital. But at Tay Ninh in the III Corps area just farther south the following day the situation was again different. The provincial hospital had 300 beds but 600 patients.

At the time of the visit 17 fresh casualties arrived as a result of a bus hitting a Vietcong land mine.

Nine Vietnamese civilians were killed, and a 6-year-old child, one of the 17 casualties taken to the hospital, died as we entered the emergency room.

Despite this tragic incident casualties constituted only 10 per cent of the patient load.

With the present level of United States and allied medical assistance, Vietnam is barely able to cope with its noncasualty medical problems.

It cannot give prompt, modern, lifesaving services to all of its casualties. Within its resources and with the aid of the United States and allied teams, it does remarkably well.

Vietnam needs and welcomes all of the medical assistance it can get from any source.

The increased tempo of the allied military action has caused increased casualties. It has resulted in increased terroristic attacks by the Vietcong.

Last weekend the town of Baclieu in the delta was hit by 30 rounds of mortar shells one night and 40 the following night.

The first night the Vietcong fire was directed toward the dependents' quarters of Vietnamese troops. The second night the firing was indiscriminate. That night there were two direct hits on the pediatric ward of the hospital.

One child was killed and seven others critically wounded.

In another ward at Cantho there was a beautiful 5-year-old girl who had lost both legs at the knees. When the Vietcong raided her village the men fled and the women and children hid in their homes. As the Vietcong left the village they threw grenades into the homes.

These are stories that can be repeated over and over and over. They happen every day.

CARE FOR CASUALTIES

Care for the overwhelming majority of these casualties should be and must be given with our help in Vietnam.

As the Committee of Responsibility has proposed, some of the extremely difficult long-term cases requiring extensive plastic reconstructive surgery can be brought to the United States. From observations on this mission their numbers fortunately are not large.

Of the burns cases this writer saw no more than 5 per cent require plastic surgery. The

aid of nearby non-Communist countries can be sought in meeting some of the problems.

After seeing for himself and talking with innumerable Vietnamese, American and allied medical specialists this writer has come to five major conclusions.

First, the load of casualties superimposed on the already overburdened Vietnamese hospitals is unbelievable. The entire system would have collapsed had it not been for the assistance of the United States and other non-Communist nations. Under the present system the Vietnamese cannot meet the additional load of increased casualties.

Second, this growing burden can be met only by increased United States and allied assistance, most of which should be given on the spot in Vietnam.

Third, Vietnam should and does welcome assistance in meeting its casualty problems from any source.

Fourth, the picture that has been painted by some in the United States of large numbers of children burned by napalm in Vietnam is grossly exaggerated. The major problems are severe orthopedic injuries, compound fractures and the complications of infections.

Fifth, the American and Allied forces are causing civilian casualties but these are unpreventable in this type of conflict and are not nearly so great as the killing and wounding of civilians by the Vietcong.

CIVILIAN CASUALTIES

All wars are cruel, but this war is especially so. Unfortunately, in spite of all that we do to avoid civilian casualties, they do occur.

Also unfortunately the Vietcong use the tactics of terror on the civilian population.

There is one thing, however, that we in the United States can do. We can supply whatever it takes to provide the services necessary to heal the wounds, however inflicted.

[From Time magazine, Mar. 24, 1967]

THE NAPALM STORY

It has been told so often, in so many publications and on so many TV programs, that no one ever thinks to question one of the more shocking horror stories of the Viet Nam war: that thousands of Vietnamese children have been savagely burned by U.S. napalm. Only last week a CBS-TV program on the war showed a supposed victim. Dr. Benjamin Spock has not only made the accusation in print; he has also helped form a "Committee of Responsibility to Save Vietnamese Children." The trouble with the story says New York Times Medical Columnist Dr. Howard Rusk, is that it is not true. Reporting from Saigon last week after a painstaking investigation, Rusk said he was unable to find a single case of a child who had been burned by napalm, and he heard of only a few.

The doctor is not a man to close his eyes to such suffering. As chairman of the department of rehabilitation of New York University's College of Medicine, he is one of the U.S.'s leading experts in the art of restoring the afflicted.* Part of his life's work has been to help the war-wounded make a comeback—first in World War II, then in Korea, and now in Viet Nam, where President Johnson has asked him to coordinate privately financed rehabilitation programs.

DANGER OF GASOLINE

His latest trip to Viet Nam, in fact, was taken primarily for medical reasons. He was anxious to see how an amputee program, which he started 15 months ago, was progressing. As he visited 20 hospitals from the 17th parallel to the Gulf of Siam, he was struck by the fact that some 85 per cent of admissions were for disease and accidents. Some

*Among the famous patients he has helped rehabilitate: Joseph Kennedy, Roy Campanella, Martyn Green, Vincent Lopez.

of the accidents involved gasoline burns. Because the cost of charcoal and kerosene has soared, some Vietnamese have tried to make do with stolen gasoline; hundred have been burned in the resulting explosions. Of all the burn cases—by accident or by non-napalm weaponry—that came to his attention, only 5 per cent required plastic surgery.

As for war casualties, Rusk discovered that most were caused by the Viet Cong, who follow a deliberate policy of killing civilians. In a hospital in the Mekong Delta, Rusk came across a five-year-old girl who had lost both legs at the knees. The Viet Cong raided her village, and when they discovered that all the men had fled, flung grenades into houses where the women and children were hiding. At another hospital, Rusk witnessed the arrival of 17 civilians who had been badly mauled when their bus ran over a Viet Cong land mine—one of the principal causes of war injuries. A six-year-old child died before Rusk's eyes.

"The load of casualties superimposed on the already overburdened hospitals is unbelievable," Rusk concludes. But the U.S. has kept the system from collapsing and will continue to do more. "It has always been our policy to help the sick and the wounded, whatever the cause, and this we are attempting to do in Viet Nam."

THE BOMBING STORY

As New York Timesman Rusk destroyed the napalm myth, the London *Economist* just as effectively disposed of another anti-U.S. allegation: that U.S. bombers are indiscriminately killing South Vietnamese civilians. U.S. bombing policy, noted the *Economist*, is based on "two apparently contrary, yet complementary principles. In certain special zones or in areas where full-scale operations are being waged against the enemy, the bombing is devastating and relentless. But in areas which contain civilians, the most elaborate ground rules are in force to try to stop them from being hurt."

As an example, said the *Economist*, no air strike can be made unless the local province chief gives his approval. This may often result in delays that allow the enemy to escape. "British television viewers," said the *Economist*, "who are conditioned to regard the air war in Viet Nam as an unrelieved exercise in American brutality, could profitably observe this curious partnership between American pilots and Vietnamese officials."

Before bombing commences, continued the *Economist*, the target is pinpointed by observers, who "reconnoiter the area for hours in slow-flying aircraft, often at great personal risk. If there is a possibility of hitting civilians, the whole thing is usually called off." In some areas of the Mekong Delta that have been declared "friendly," U.S. patrol boats are forbidden to return enemy fire for fear of hitting civilians. B-52 bombers, used only in full-scale open fighting, are electronically controlled and have a "remarkable" degree of accuracy. "The picture is reasonably clear," concluded the *Economist*. "Perhaps never before has a belligerent wielded such a preponderance of power with so much restraint."

WHICH CHINA BELONGS IN THE U.N.?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the April issue of the *Elks* magazine contains an excellent article written by Bruno Shaw entitled "Which China Belongs in the U.N.?" The article makes a fine presentation of the arguments for and against the seating of Red China in the United Nations, and happily points out most favorably the argument against seating Red China in the United Nations in the face of the prohibition now con-

tained in the Charter of the United Nations.

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

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

WHICH CHINA BELONGS IN THE U.N.? "LET'S LOOK AT THE RECORD"

(By Bruno Shaw)

Next November, for the 17th time, the question of seating Communist China as a member of the United Nations will again be brought before the General Assembly. In the months until then, we can expect to see a tremendously intensified drive, employing every available means of pressure and every imaginable propaganda device, to change American policy and the General Assembly's vote from "No" to "Yes."

Those who favor Red China's representation in the United Nations fall into two groups. One takes the position that the United States is committed to support the independence of Taiwan (Formosa), which is known generally nowadays as Free China, and this group favors what it calls a Two-China Policy. This would mean the continuance of membership of the Republic of China in the UN, but only as the island of Taiwan, and the seating of Red China as the government of the China mainland. The basis for having a United Nations, this group says, is universality—it must have as members all the nations of the world, without excluding any because its government might not meet with the approval of some of the others; and, inasmuch as the government at Peking, like it or not, is the government of 700,000,000 people, you cannot make believe that it does not exist. So goes the argument of one group.

The other group in favor of Red China's representation in the UN would go much further. It would throw the Republic of China out of the United Nations and seat Communist China in its place, on the ground that the island of Taiwan is merely a province of China. It is the contention of this group that since China is a founding member of the United Nations, the only question is whether or not the government at Peking is now the government of China. It is, they say, and as such it does not need to be admitted to the UN because it already is a member, deprived of its rightful seat in the organization.

This second group also expresses the belief that Red China, by exercising the rights and privileges of membership in the UN, will be more inclined to assume the responsibilities that go with it, and will in time accommodate itself to peaceful coexistence within the UN and with the world outside.

Opponents of seating Red China in the United Nations belong to only one group. The United Nations Charter, they point out, restricts membership in the United Nations to "peace loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations."

Communist China has declared one of its objectives to be the destruction of the United Nations as it is now constituted. China has instigated and supported violent insurrection and subversion in Asia, Africa, and in the South Pacific, and is a major threat to peace in those areas. Its stated goal is totalitarian Communist world domination by means of violence. It is the only nation that has been at war with the United Nations. That war, in Korea, is still not terminated. Although by resolution of the United Nations, Communist China was declared the aggressor against the United Nations in Korea, it has never retreated from its posi-

tion that the UN, as a "tool of United States imperialism," was the aggressor.

Communist China, its opponents contend, could hardly be called a "peace loving state," and it therefore cannot qualify for membership in the United Nations in accordance with the UN's Charter requirements.

In weighing the pros and cons of the proposal to seat Communist China in the United Nations and to expel the Republic of China, it might be a good idea to follow the admonition of the late Alfred E. Smith, one of New York's most down-to-earth governors: "Let's look at the record."

First, then, let us take a look at the record of Communist China, through the eyes of some of the new African nations that have had first-hand experience with Peking:

Foreign Minister Assouan Arsene Usher of the Republic of the Ivory Coast: "The People's (Communist) Republic of China wages war against all . . . and has done serious harm to the small African countries which need an atmosphere of peace and fraternity in order to catch up on their lag in development."

Minister Thaddee Bagaragaza of the Republic of Rwanda: "The fact that People's China represents one-quarter of the population of the world does not give it the right to preach any alleged revolution in developing countries, or to support subversion in our countries by military training and arming of rebels."

Antoine Guimall, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Central African Republic: "A country should not enter the Organization (UN) until it has furnished proof of its will to respect the sacred principle of coexistence and, above all, of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other states. The People's Republic of China does not seem to fulfill these fundamental conditions."

Justin Bomboko, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic Republic of Congo: "During 1964 and 1965, a rebellion—with which all the world is familiar—had particularly tragic repercussions in our country—it cost thousands of Congolese lives and reduced to rubble a part of our infrastructure. These events have established an unequivocal and direct intervention on the part of the People's Republic of China."

But of all the countries in Africa, the experience of Ghana at the hands of the Chinese Communists has been the worst. Under its Communist-oriented dictator Kwame Nkrumah, Ghana became a training ground for subversives recruited from one end of the African continent to the other. Communist Chinese instructors trained them in the use of explosives and in guerrilla warfare. And when the recruits from other African countries had been taught to use these weapons, and had been sent back to their own countries, Russian patrol boats smuggled arms to them from storehouses in Ghana.

On Feb. 24, 1966, the regime of Kwame Nkrumah was overthrown while the dictator was on a state visit to Communist China. In a White Paper issued by the government which took over, this charge is made: "The tragedy of Africa is wrought by those who preach brotherhood while plotting the downfall of others. The liberation of Ghana was a bitter blow to all these Communists who had come to Ghana to train recruits from neighboring African states in guerrilla warfare and espionage. Like animals running in front of a forest fire they fled the country."

Now, let us look at the not-so-well-known facts about the economic and social development of Taiwan, and its relations with undeveloped countries in Africa and elsewhere.

While United States aid contributed immeasurably to the improvement of social and economic life in Free China, that nation, which only ten years ago was as heavily dependent on United States aid as Vietnam is today, reached the point of economic self-sufficiency on July 1, 1965. On that day

United States aid to the Republic of China was terminated by voluntary agreement.

In its aid phaseout announcement, the United States State Department declared: "The United States Government notes the interest and willingness of industrial and financial institutions and foreign private investors to provide an increasing flow of development capital to Taiwan. The United States will continue to encourage this trend."

The phenomenal economic growth of Free China has been all the more remarkable in view of the necessity of maintaining a high degree of military preparedness to combat the threat of Communist aggression. In the Taiwan Straits the war is more hot than cold. Communist shells scream through the air over Quemoy and Matsu on an every-other-day basis, and sometimes kill and maim civilians and destroy property. And in the air there are frequent exchanges of gunfire between Republic of China and Communist airplanes over the Taiwan Straits.

But none of this has interfered with the determined effort which in ten years has transformed Taiwan from a receiver of aid to a giver of aid to other countries in Asia, Africa, and South America.

Since the discontinuance of United States aid, there has been a steady inflow of investment in Taiwan by overseas Chinese and foreign firms and individuals in manufacturing enterprises for pharmaceuticals, chemicals, telecommunication equipment and components, and electrical appliances. Most of the investors in these new plants are from Japan and the United States. Others are from Switzerland, England, the Philippines, and Canada.

The result of this rapid industrial and economic expansion has been an economic growth rate in Taiwan of 7.5 percent in 1966, and a per capita income increase of 4.5 percent.

Rural areas in Taiwan enjoyed similar prosperity in 1966. Farmers' bank savings totalled \$84,850,000, an increase of \$50,450,000 in the past four years. Hawaii is generally thought of as the world's greatest producer of pineapples. It is. But Taiwan leads the world in canning pineapples for export. Taiwan also grows excellent oranges, which it exports both fresh and canned. And, in the past few years, Taiwan has taken France's place as the world's top mushroom grower. Rice and sugar, of course, still are Taiwan's greatest export crops and principal earners of foreign exchange.

Taiwan's industrial expansion in the past ten years would seem incredible except for the fact that the plants are there, they are producing, and they are visible wage and profit earners for all concerned—workers, investors, and customers. In these ten years the number of manufacturing plants in Taiwan increased from 1,000 to 25,000. Government encouragement led to a sharp upsurge in private industry, which accounted for only about one-third of the nation's production in 1952 but which grew to more than two-thirds by 1966. Electric power, essential to industrial growth, rose from 331,545 kilowatts to 1,100,000. The volume of railway and highway transportation shot up by two and a half times, and that of shipping and harbor loadings trebled.

Compulsory education enrolls 96.7 percent of all school age children in Taiwan. High school enrollment reached 500,000 last year, and college and university enrollment 50,000, about four times that in 1952. Such formerly endemic diseases as cholera, smallpox, scarlet fever, malaria, and typhoid have been practically eradicated, and the mortality rate of the nation has decreased from 9.9 to 6.1 per 1,000.

In 1960 an unprecedented number of African countries achieved independence, 17 of them. And in that year the government of the Republic of China decided to help them develop and improve their methods of

agriculture, the field in which Free China experts could be of greatest assistance in the struggle of the new nations for economic progress and self-sufficiency.

In October 1961, Liberia became the first African country to request agricultural cooperation, and two months later a 16-member Chinese farming demonstration mission—the first under what became known as "Operation Vanguard"—was sent to Liberia to demonstrate to the Liberian farmers the improved techniques of rice culture that had been developed in Taiwan. Since then agricultural cooperation projects have expanded rapidly in countries throughout Africa, in response to the increasing demand for the services of Chinese agricultural technicians.

Up to mid-1966, 467 visitors from African countries had come to Taiwan to observe at first hand the modern methods of cultivation of rice and other crops that might be introduced or improved in their homelands. And in response to their requests for agricultural technical assistance, missions have been sent from Taiwan to Liberia, Libya, Ivory Coast, Gabon, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Niger, Cameroun, Upper Volta, Chad, Togo, Malawi, and Gambia.

Illustrative of the performance of the Chinese agricultural missions in Africa is the first one, sent to Liberia in 1961. The demonstration site was at Gbedin, some 175 miles from the capital, Monrovia. The 16-member Chinese mission started its work by reclaiming 20 acres of land that had been allowed to go back to the bush after previous experiments by United Nations and American agricultural missions had not panned out. It took back-breaking work to clear and prepare the land, and to construct a simple dam and irrigation channels. Seeds, including specimens brought from Taiwan, were sown in March of 1962, and the first rice crop was harvested four months later with a yield averaging 3,600 pounds per acre. In the past two years, the mission's average yield of rice was six times the yield that had been obtained by native farmers on their own land.

The Liberian government, impressed by the success of the Chinese agricultural methods where others had failed, initiated a Land Development Project, starting with 500 acres to be settled by 70 farm families, employing the techniques taught them by the Chinese technicians. For the first time in the history of Liberia, said President William V. S. Tubman, the prospect of self sufficiency in rice production was about to become a reality.

In Senegal, it is reported by United States agencies there, farmers from Taiwan have carved rice paddies out of the desert. Senegal does not even have diplomatic relations with the Republic of China, but that has not deterred the Taiwan government from lending a helping hand to Senegal, which needs agricultural guidance and assistance.

Last December the Republic of China established formal diplomatic relations with the new republics of Botswana and Lesotho, and began discussions with them on a program for Chinese cooperation in agriculture. By the end of 1966 there were more than 1,000 farmers from Free China rendering technical assistance in 18 African countries.

Jeff Endrst, of the *Indianapolis Star*, after completing an extensive trip through Africa, summed up what he saw this way: "The Republic of China offers talent, not ideology. It does not discriminate against those who flirt or even side with Communist China. Its agricultural teams and engineering experts go into the farthest corners of this dark continent to share the hardship, the food, the poor housing of the local people."

Chinese know-how in rice production has been called on to help improve farming techniques even in the Philippines, where rice has been a staple of the people since time immemorial.

In South Vietnam, Chinese civilian teams of 12 to 15 are working as medical personnel, handicraft specialists, and counter-infiltration experts. Engineers on one-year service contracts, made through the United States Agency for International Development, are assisting the Vietnamese government in rural reconstruction, highway construction, and refugee resettlement.

Free China's manufacture of heavy equipment such as railway rolling stock is not only vital to free countries in southeast Asia, but of great benefit to Free China itself. Thailand, a member of the anti-Communist group of Far Eastern nations, recently ordered 100 railway freight cars from Taiwan, earning more than \$500,000 for the Taiwan Railway Administration shops. Other Thai traffic arteries received similar aid from Taiwan when, in January of this year, 78 Chinese engineers and technicians left for Thailand to assist in the construction of a new highway.

The annual vote of the General Assembly of the United Nations on the question of seating Red China has swung back and forth over the past sixteen years, but it has never gone so far as to be carried affirmatively. The nearest it came to that was in 1965, when the General Assembly vote was 47 to 47, with 20 abstentions. This consistent decrease in the anti-Chinese Communist attitude was found in large measure among the new African nations, whose governments believe in the need for universality of membership regardless of the nature of any member government.

In the Nov. 29, 1966, General Assembly vote, however, there came a dramatic change on the part of many of those same African nations, which by now had become quite worried about infiltration and subversion by Chinese Communist agents from Peking. In 1966, the General Assembly vote was 46 nations in favor of seating Red China, 57 against, with 17 abstentions.

While the anti-Peking forces picked up 10 votes in 1966, 57 as against 47 in 1965, there was more switching of position than the tally indicated. Among the new countries in the anti-Peking column were two newly admitted members, Lesotho and Guyana, along with Chile, Congo (Kinshasa), Dahomey, Iceland, Libya, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, and the Central African Republic.

It had become quite apparent by now that an intelligent choice between two Chinas, based on the record, was available to the free world: between Communist China, which has demonstrated in word and deed the nature of its threat to world peace, and the Republic of China, of which even the United Nations Association of the United States, in its effort to sway public opinion in favor of the Chinese Communist regime, in a public statement made on the eve of the General Assembly's 1966 vote, was compelled by the hard facts to include this admission: "The history of the Republic of China as a member of the United Nations has been characterized by responsible participation in twenty United Nations bodies, significant contributions to the international community through its bilateral technical assistance program, a strong loyalty to the United Nations Charter, and the fact that it is recognized by fifty-five United Nations members."

ACTIONS SPEAK LOUDER THAN WORDS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, recently I received a letter from Mr. Max Dickerson, vice president of the Commercial National Bank, Kansas City, Kans. The letter expresses quite well the attitude that a good number of people in the agriculture sector have re-

garding the administration's responsibility for the current farm price situation, when Mr. Dickerson says, "actions speak much louder than words."

Mr. Dickerson points out that although administration officials may deny that their actions over the past year have served to depress prices, the record is quite clear. It is a record of a long series of actions such as the massive sales of Government-owned stocks of wheat and feed grains last spring, the cattlehide embargo, the manipulation of Department of Defense purchases of livestock products, the pleas of administration officials, including the President, to consumers to buy cheaper cuts of meat, the curtailment of wheat exports, the excessive increase in wheat acreage allotments, and other such moves which have had a clear and direct effect on farm prices. Moreover, these actions have created the impression that the administration is determined to keep the lid on farm prices and to depress those prices wherever possible, regardless of what it may publicly say to the contrary.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Dickerson's letter, dated March 21, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE COMMERCIAL NATIONAL BANK,
Kansas City, Kans., March 21, 1967.

Senator JAMES B. PEARSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: I appreciated your letter of March 17, 1967 very much. The agricultural factor of the economy certainly needs a boost as it is definitely lagging behind other factors of the economy. Our bank carries approximately seven million in Kansas agricultural loans most of the time. A large volume of this amount originates through country banks. From the handling of these loans, analyzing financial statements and so forth, we know what is happening to agriculture. We certainly share the feeling that the present administration has talked one way but their deeds and actions have been just the opposite and in this case the actions do lower farm prices. I presume the administration, in the interest of votes, tries to capitalize on low food prices, consequently they are not about to let agriculture receive prices equal to other sectors of the economy.

Such examples are selling large stocks of government grain, the hide embargo, the lowering of export subsidies on wheat and the public statements concerning the purchase of lower priced cuts of meat, the manipulation of defense department purchases and the many talks made by Esther Peterson. Actions speak much louder than words and the actions of our department of agriculture and the administration is not for a prosperous agricultural economy. It is my understanding that Dr. John Schnitzer made the statement to the American National Cattlemen's Association that the hide embargo was a price control measure.

The department officials may deny their actions to depress prices but actions speak louder than words. Cattle feeders have been losing from twenty to thirty-five dollars per head on the fat cattle they have sold the last four months, yet there has been nothing from the administration urging people to buy meat since cattle prices are lower than they have been for many months.

I appreciate your interest in the situation, very much.

Sincerely yours,

MAX DICKERSON,
Vice President.

WHY VIETNAM?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I invite the Senate's attention to a most perceptive and important essay published in the March issue of the proceedings of the U.S. Naval Institute. The essay, entitled "Distant Rampart," is the Institute's 1967 prize essay and was written by Prof. Harold W. Rood of Claremont Men's College.

It is a thoughtful analysis of the question, "Why Vietnam?" It calls to our attention the single elemental point—that our national security and survival are involved.

I commend the essay to the attention of Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

The central strategic objective of the United States is—as it always has been—the prevention of direct attack upon the United States. The fashionable phrases of present-day defense planning notwithstanding, the goal of U.S. foreign policy and military policy is to secure the Western Hemisphere in order to defend the United States.

Deterrence, Limited War, Escalation, and the rest of the jargon which often characterizes discussions involving national security—including the current debate on Vietnam—tend to obscure the strategic problem rather than to illuminate it.

The American Revolution was as much a response to the threat to the colonies from European powers as it was a reaction to English abuse of the colonists' liberties. Repeatedly, the colonists had been subjected to the consequences of wars that had originated in Europe, had been fought in North America, and invariably had been resolved to the benefit of England rather than of her colonies. American foreign policy after the Revolution was aimed at disengaging European powers from North America, not alone to permit American expansion but to keep the continent from becoming Europe's battlefield. The Civil War, whatever its economic and political origins, turned on the determination of Lincoln and the North to prevent the splitting of the United States into two separate nations. Such a split, had the Confederacy won, would have faced the North with endless coalitions between the Confederacy and any European powers with territorial ambitions in North America. It is easy to forget that one consequence of the long war was a French attempt to make an Austrian prince the ruler of Mexico. The victory of the North and the consequent reunion with the South effectively frustrated French ambitions. Had the South won, not only might Maximilian and his French master have succeeded in Mexico, but the expansion of the United States to the Pacific might once again have become subject to European arbitration rather than American determination.

Exclusion of the great European powers from North America permitted the growth of population and the expansion of the territory of the United States, leaving the young republic free to industrialize and prosper without European interference. A significant factor which influenced the rate of expansion and industrialization was the dominant position held by Great Britain as the principal sea power in the world.

Once Britain had finally accepted the viability of the United States demonstrated by a Northern victory in the Civil War and implied by the British North America Act of 1867—which granted federation to Canada—it was British sea power which defended the American Atlantic Coast, excluded European adventures in South America, and permitted the long-existing U.S. commercial interests in the Far East

to develop. British investment in American railroads, mining, and other burgeoning enterprises hastened U.S. industrialization while the British taxpayers subsidized American defense by maintaining a powerful and pugnacious Royal Navy.

That such Yankee development served British interests is self-evident. That it also served American interests is more easily overlooked. It should be enough to recall that there was no substantial threat to American territory between the end of the Civil War and the beginning of World War I.

Military threats to the United States originate from the Eurasian land-mass because that enormous area—the largest in the world—is the home of all the other great world powers. Perhaps Americans would not be so quick to speak in terms of an Asiatic policy or a European policy if they were to visualize their own continent—North America—and South America as little more than continent-sized islands off the west coast of Europe and off the east coast of Asia.

Moreover, events in Europe have almost always affected U.S. interests in the Far East just as events in the Far East have affected U.S. interests in Europe.

The unification of Germany and its growth into a great military and naval power before World War I, for example, forced the withdrawal of British naval power from the Far East at a time when Japanese interests had begun to conflict with those of the United States, and Japanese power had become significant enough to defeat a European great power, Imperial Russia. To secure British interests in the Indian Ocean and the China seas, Britain became allied with Japan, whose respectable fleet provided willing substitutes for the warships which Britain had been forced to withdraw to reinforce her fleet in the Channel and the North Sea. That events transpiring in Europe could affect America's strategic position in the Far East was nowhere more evident than when, during the course of a war in Europe, a central European power—Germany—would offer an alliance to Japan and Mexico aimed at keeping the United States from supporting Britain and France against Germany.

When the United States entered World War I, it did so because of events that had been set in motion in Central Europe, events which appeared to have no relation to the defense of North America or the interests of the United States. Yet, those events and their consequences led to the deployment of two million U.S. servicemen into Europe. Units of the U.S. Battle Force operated with the British Grand Fleet from bases at Rosyth, Scapa Flow, and Invergordon. U.S. naval operations were carried on from the British Isles, the Coast of France, in the Bay of Biscay, and as far distant as Porto Corsino in the Adriatic. U.S. ships were sunk and U.S. seamen were killed within the coastal waters of the United States as a consequence of the policies of a government located in Central Europe.

A direct result of the European peace settlement was the transfer of the Marshall, Marianas, and Caroline Islands to the control of Japan. Japanese possession of those islands would contribute largely to American inability to defend the Philippines or to interfere with a swift Japanese conquest of territories from Melanesia west to the Burmese Indian frontier in the early months of 1942.

Despite the fact that the United States systematically avoided involvement in Europe after World War I, the policies of a re-arming Germany were to jeopardize American as well as British interests in the Far East. Distracted by events in Central Europe and the Mediterranean, Great Britain found itself incapable of providing any real barrier to Japanese expansion. The "no-war-for-ten-years" rule which governed British de-

fense estimates in the Twenties and early Thirties left the one major British Far Eastern base, Singapore, without adequate defenses.

In 1940, the Fall of France, the Defense of Britain, and the war in the Mediterranean and the Middle East left Great Britain with little strength to spare for the defense of the Indian Ocean and Malaysia. Japanese occupation of Indochina, a consequence of French defeat in Europe, sealed the fate of Burma, Thailand, Malaya, the Netherlands East Indies, and Singapore. The course of the European war between 1939 and 1940 forced the deployment of American military power into the Atlantic. Once again, the policies of a Central European power were to result in the sinking of American coastal shipping and the death of American citizens in U.S. coastal waters.

Events transpiring in Europe were to provide the opportunity for Japanese expansion in the Far East. The attack on Pearl Harbor and eventually on parts of Alaska demonstrated that what occurred in the Far East could have direct and painful consequences for the people of the United States.

If many Americans had cherished the illusion that isolationism would protect them from the play of politics among the other great powers, the Army and Navy did not. They had formulated a national strategy which would meet and eventually defeat the threat from across both oceans.

It was not the strategy preferred by the men who thought in terms of continental defense and who bore the constitutional responsibility for providing the means with which to carry out that defense. Such a man, the Chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee in 1934, expressed his notion of what constituted an adequate strategy for the United States:

"As I view the situation, the Navy, upon a defensive mission, would have to guard, so far as the continental United States is concerned, only ten or twelve, possibly, of entry ports toward which any enemy fleet might advance in order to invade the integrity of the United States; whereas the Army, through its Air Force, through its coast guard, and through its land forces, is expected to defend the entire frontier, whether by land or by water . . ."

It was the good fortune of the United States to have military planners who grasped the strategic position of the United States better than did the Chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee. Captain Harry E. Yarnell, Commander W. S. Pye, and Commander H. H. Frost, in a confidential memorandum written in the Plans Division of the Office of Naval Operations in 1920 summarized that position:

"The strategic situation of the United States is unique in that it is situated at a great distance from all other naval powers. In a war between two maritime nations situated on the opposite sides of an ocean, no important results can be gained as long as the fleets of both nations remain in their home bases. In order to exert any decisive pressure upon a nation it is usually necessary to occupy important sectors of its territory and defeat its military forces; . . . if it is considered essential to land important expeditionary forces in enemy territory, it is obviously necessary for our fleet to secure and exercise the command of the sea in a large sector off the enemy's coast. This means an overseas naval campaign."

Captain Pye, writing in the U.S. Naval Institute PROCEEDINGS in December 1924, maintained further that even in a war for the defense of the United States only an offensive war could be expected to alter the policy of the attacking enemy.

If military and naval appropriations between the wars never approached the scale required for adequate defense of the United States, the military and naval professionals provided the country with the concepts and organization which would make it possible

for the United States to carry the war into the enemy's homeland. The techniques of amphibious warfare, the fast carrier task force, long-range submarine operations, strategic air bombardment, and armored warfare were worked out sufficiently to shape the organization and training of the Army and Navy before the United States ever entered World War II.

The consequences of such foresight were seen within less than a year after the attack on Pearl Harbor. By the end of August 1942, American aircraft were in combat over Western Europe, and American troops had made their first landing in occupied France. By December 1942, an American field army was deployed in North Africa and American forces were engaged on the road of Tokyo in the Southwest Pacific. In the course of the war, American soldiers and sailors fought countless battles in scores of campaigns, most of which were conducted far from the shores of the United States or even of the Western Hemisphere.

The conduct of U.S. military operations in World War II serves to emphasize the assumptions which have been the basis of U.S. military strategy in the 20th century. The first assumption is that it is preferable to defend the United States by fighting the initial defensive battles of any war as close to the enemy's homeland as possible or, at least, as far away from continental United States as possible.

The second assumption is that the initial strategic defensive in any war is only the prelude which will make possible the assumption of the strategic offensive should that be necessary.

The fundamental strategic situation of the United States has not altered since the end of World War II. The cost of America's failure to influence the development of events in Central Europe and the Far East in the 1920s and 1930s was the exhaustion of British power, expended to hold the line until the United States became half-ready. The disastrous defeat of British forces in the Far East in 1942 hastened the breakup of the British, French, and Dutch Empires in the Far East and destroyed any substantial hope of a China unified under a regime other than the Communists'. The price of America's illusion that it need not concern itself with events in Central Europe was the recession of British power, the defeat and eventual alienation of France, and the abandonment of Eastern Europe to the domination of the Soviet Union.

U. S. forces deployed in Germany and elsewhere around the world after World War II seemed to indicate that most Americans agreed that the principal threats to their country would continue to originate in Europe and Asia. And there is no comfort whatever in having been right; in having watched the ancient Eurasian volcano erupt again and again since the end of World War II—Berlin, Lebanon, Cuba, the Formosa Straits, and now Vietnam.

Yet, the war in Vietnam has raised serious issues in the minds of many Americans about the morality and utility of U.S. policy in Asia. The noisiest discussions are carried on by people who continue to enjoy without question the benefits of life in a powerful and rich America. The easy sentimentality of the American intellectual, himself shielded from the rigors of a world which often demands more of its inhabitants than it gives, focuses on the plight of the South Vietnamese and their determined attackers from the North. Nationalism and patriotism which seem despicable when manifested in their fellow Americans, is counted a virtue—for who but a patriot would explode a booby trap in some crowded South Vietnamese street?

Yet, more thoughtful Americans, less given to polemics, also find themselves seriously disturbed. Their doubts, however, stem from the heavy price being paid by both

Americans and Vietnamese as a consequence of U. S. operations in Vietnam.

What possible strategic imperatives could be served by U. S. operations in Vietnam? How do U. S. military operations there conform to the central strategic objective of the United States?

Part of the answer to these questions might lie in an examination of the sequence of events which led to the loss of Singapore in 1942. These events can help to define Vietnam's strategic significance. In 1939, Japan, engaged in the conquest of China, occupied the Island of Hainan in the Gulf of Tonkin and the Spratly Islands off the coast of Indochina. Following the surrender of France in June 1940, Japan forced France to accede to a Japanese share in the administration of Indochina as well as the right to use Saigon as an air base. In the following year, Japan progressively occupied the remainder of Indochina and began to bring pressure on Thailand. On the 8th of December 1941, from bases at Saigon, Camrahn Bay, and Hainan, attacks were launched by sea and air across the Gulf of Siam against the Siamese coast and Kota Baru in Malaya. With about 60,000 combat troops, supported by air and naval forces, the Japanese were able to seize Thailand, Malaya, and Singapore within 70 days. By the middle of 1942, the Japanese were in a position to make raids into the Bay of Bengal and to secure their hold on Burma, having conquered the Philippines and the Netherlands East Indies as well.

The strategic position of the Chinese today is similar to that of the Japanese in 1939 with some interesting differences. Chinese forces are on the borders of India, Nepal, Sikkim, and Bhutan. From Ladakh in Kashmir to the Diphu Pass in eastern Assam, Chinese forces intrude virtually at will across the Chinese frontier. The passes and old forts along the Burma-Chinese frontier are in Chinese hands by the treaty of 1960, while the Chinese promote disaffection among the Burmese border tribes. North Vietnam remains independent at the pleasure of the Chinese government. Malaysia is fraught with internal difficulties. Singapore has defected from the Federation, and Indonesia's situation is problematical.

The Chinese position includes air and naval bases on Hainan, the firm possession of the Chinese coast from North Vietnam to North Korea, and access at its pleasure to Laos, Cambodia, and North Vietnam. China is unified, save for Formosa, has a respectable and sizeable army, and shows a promising capacity to manufacture and deliver nuclear weapons. Besides 20-plus Soviet W-class submarines, the Chinese are building an undetermined number of G-class submarines capable of launching ballistic missiles.

The U.S. position in the Pacific is no longer what it was in 1941. The territory which came under direct Japanese attack early in the war, the Hawaiian Islands and the Aleutians are each sovereign states today. As territories, the United States could have bartered, sold, or ceded them with hardly a second thought. As states, Alaska and Hawaii may only be separated from the United States by changing the U.S. Constitution. Yet, Hawaii is closer to Peking than it is to Washington, D.C. The Aleutian Islands at their westernmost tip are closer to China than they are to Seattle, Washington.

Where once the security of the United States could conveniently, it seemed, rest on Alaska and Hawaii in the Pacific, those two states now have the right to demand the same kind of security which each of them once helped furnish to the continental United States.

It is easy to forget that the only base on U.S. territory close to China, is Guam. Should all the countries in the Far East ask the United States to abandon the American bases of their territory, the United States

would still have Guam. Guam's significance is somewhat tarnished, however, when it is recalled that it took the Japanese about 20 minutes to seize it in December 1941.

Bases in the Philippines, South Korea, South Vietnam, Japan, and even Okinawa remain accessible to the United States only so long as it suits the interest of countries upon whose territories the bases are located. The French have already demonstrated how simple it is to get foreign military bases removed from national territory when the nation's interest so dictates. All one really has to do to get the United States to move its bases off one's territory is to ask the United States to leave.

U.S. bases in the Philippines, for example, are accessible only so long as it appears to the people of the Philippines that the United States is indeed capable of defending those islands. While we all like to think they remember the United States best for its liberation of the Philippines in World War II, it is quite possible that what the Filipinos really remember best is that the United States was incapable of holding the Philippines against the Japanese, and that MacArthur's sanguine "I shall return," marked the beginning of three years of painful Japanese occupation.

The U.S. base on Okinawa is secure only as long as the United States can side-step Japanese pressure for return of that island. American access to bases within Japan will continue just so long as the Japanese feel that America has a chance of remaining a significant force in the Far East. Formosa will remain available as long as Chiang Kai-shek or his successors think the illusion of a triumphant Nationalist return to the mainland is worth cherishing.

The United States may not, at present, deploy forces into Malaysia or Singapore, and the British, under financial pressure at home, are reducing their forces in that area.

Yet, American bases overseas are the one means of reducing the probability that a major war would be fought on U.S. territory while contributing to the possibility that major war may be avoided entirely. The capacity to carry war to the enemy is essential to the national strategy in war, the possession of such a capability may deter the outbreak of war entirely. If the enemy faces the realization that resorting to war will lead to his certain defeat, he may eschew war in order to avoid the possibility of having to live with the fruits of his defeat.

If war comes in any case, American bases on the enemy's periphery force him to deploy forces to reduce those bases, thereby limiting his freedom of action in the initial stages of the war. Even in a strategic nuclear war, those bases overseas from which U.S. forces may launch nuclear strikes are targets with the highest priority. Thus, tactical aircraft in forward positions, aircraft carriers, medium bombers, and Polaris submarines are capable of launching devastating nuclear strikes against any country without U.S.-based ICBMs having to be engaged. If an enemy chooses to strike the United States first, he does so at the risk of receiving a devastating attack from U.S. nuclear power based overseas. If an enemy chooses to employ his strategic forces, in part, to take out U.S. nuclear forces overseas, then he has fewer missiles to fire at strategic striking forces based in the United States.

It is this kind of strategic imperative which must be borne in mind when considering the war in Vietnam and U.S. policy in Asia. It is not just that the dominoes might fall if the United States were to withdraw from Vietnam without defeating the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese forces. It is more than that. Such a withdrawal would signal the general withdrawal of U.S. forces from the island shield of Asia.

Thailand, like Cambodia, would be forced to accept an accommodation advantageous to

China. South Vietnam would be reunited with North Vietnam and both would remain independent—if that was China's wish. The possibility that Ho Chi Minh might be an Asian Tito is nonsense. Chinese forces are in a position to dominate completely the borders of North Vietnam with China and the waters of the Gulf of Tonkin, the coastal waters of North Vietnam.

The withdrawal of U.S. forces from Indochina and Thailand would leave northern Malaysia exposed to the same kind of attack to which they were exposed in World War II. There are already guerrilla bands operating in the border areas between south Thailand and Malaysia.

Such a defeat of U.S. policy in the Far East would force the Philippines to reconsider their attitude toward China and at best would lead them to an alliance with Japan if not subject them to a massive revival of Huk operations. Indonesia, barely able to sustain itself politically and economically, would at best dissolve into civil war and at worst become stepping stones for the extension of Chinese influence.

For the Japanese, an alliance with the United States unable to maintain its position in Indochina would become unthinkable. After all, if the United States cannot defeat a minor Asian power like North Vietnam, could one really assume that it could defeat China? Therefore, Japan would have to consider its own interests, which might require the development of a large nuclear arsenal to meet the threat from China and entertain the notion of an alliance between Japan and the Soviet Union.

What would eventuate for the strategic position of the United States would be a defense of the Pacific Coast resting on Hawaii and Alaska. The initiative in any Pacific war would rest with the Asiatic power which might, under those conditions, be Japan and the Soviet Union as easily as it might be China.

If, on the other hand, the United States and its allies in South Vietnam can secure that country from attack by the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese, it is possible that a stable and prosperous country may be formed which can defend its own borders sufficiently to force any attacker to mount a serious offensive, an offensive which would trigger U.S. response in the form of deployment of U.S. forces back into the bases which have been established in that country.

The strategic defense of the United States in any war with China would be eased considerably if American power had bases from which to deploy close to the coast of China. From bases in South Vietnam, U.S. air may cover the operations of carrier task forces and antisubmarine warfare elements which can close the South China Sea to Chinese use. A strategic threat may be posed against the Chinese base on Hainan and in the waters of the Gulf of Tonkin. From bases in the Philippines, South Korea, Formosa, and Okinawa, Chinese access to the sea may be severely restricted while the Chinese must deploy forces along their entire coast from the Gulf of Chihli to North Vietnam to meet the possibility of attacks which might be launched anywhere along the coast at the convenience of a sea power which controlled Chinese coastal waters.

Chinese forces deployed to meet the threat of lightning descents on their exposed coastline would not be available for attacks on India, Burma, Malaysia, and Thailand. Under such conditions, the Chinese would be confronted by a war in which the United States could levy damage at will on the Chinese homeland, while itself possessing only nominal power to attack the United States directly.

Without such a strategic position in the Far East, the United States must be prepared to meet ballistic missile attacks on Hawaii, Alaska, and the coast of the mainland United States, with forces that could be de-

ployed only from continental United States, Alaska, and Hawaii.

The choice confronting the United States is either to continue to fight in Vietnam with the hope that a military defeat administered to South Vietnam's attackers will promote the stability of that country and provide deterrence to any Chinese thought of war with the United States, or else wait and risk war with China when that country has developed a full-sized nuclear arsenal, backed by the capacity to command the sea areas around the island shield of Asia.

Events in Asia, as we have noted, influence events in Europe and they, in turn, bear directly on U.S. interests. Were the United States to become involved in a war with China one must expect that the Soviet Union would use the occasion to solve some of its outstanding problems in Europe. In return for a pledge of Soviet neutrality in a Sino-American war, the Soviet Union would attempt to extract concessions from the United States in Europe and the Middle East. Berlin would be the most obvious concession. Soviet neutrality spelled out in terms of the best interest of the Soviet Union would mean the supply of materials to China so that she might continue the war with the United States under conditions where the United States would be in no position to object or even to interfere. Such developments might well lead to an isolated America whose only resource for resisting Soviet incursions into Western Europe and Chinese occupation of the island shield of Asia would be trans-oceanic nuclear war. This would mean war on the soil of the United States, the very eventuality which generations of Americans have sacrificed to avoid.

It is an enduring quality of Americans that they are critical and oftentimes cynical of U.S. foreign policy and of the conduct of American wars. At the same time, Americans are impatient of programs whose fulfillment is long delayed. The defense of the United States and the promotion of free governments wherever possible are closely related goals of U.S. foreign policy. It must not be expected that realization of those goals can come only through occasional effort in those international situations which provide completely unambiguous threats. Every threat will be ambiguous, the more so, the earlier the United States attempts to meet it.

It was no comfort to the people of Poland in September 1939 that the threat from Germany was at last unequivocal. It will be no comfort to the American people a decade hence that they can at least be certain that the threat from China is real, if the United States is no longer in a position to meet and cancel the threat.

Foreign policies and the imperatives of strategy do not change to suit the mood of the current intellectual fashions in criticism. The hard facts of great power politics and the constant threat of war are the price of existence in a world peopled by dogmatists. Idealism and compassion are ready companions when the ideal has become dogma to be impressed on the non-believer. Whatever sympathy one may feel for the Chinese and Soviet peoples in their attempt to build the kind of world they wish to live in, one must not let such sympathy blind us to the fact that there is a fundamental difference between the world we would choose and the world they have chosen. Chinese and Russian drives to shape the world to their pleasure are the same drives that would deny Americans the right to do as well. Accommodation may one day be possible. But no one ever has to accommodate a loser.

A "POTATO-IN-THE-SKY" EXPERIMENT

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the people of Maine have long been proud of

the fact that our beloved State produces the finest vegetable in the world—the Maine potato. For a long, long time, people throughout the world in their ecstatic gourmet delight with the incomparable Maine potato have described its taste thrill as "out of this world."

But now the potato has taken on a new value—a very real and specific "out of this world" value with its selection by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for a starring role in a test in outer space environment among the stars. The potato has been chosen by the Office of Space Science and Applications for the potato biorhythm experiment to study its metabolic activity and oxygen consumption, which is important to the safety of astronauts in long flights.

Nearly all living organisms show periodicity or rhythmicity in their daily activities. When this daily rhythm is disturbed by change such as flying to California or Europe, the individual is usually upset temporarily. When the length of day-night cycles is altered experimentally, plants and animals may become sick or die.

It is unknown whether these 24-hour rhythms are inherent in the organism or whether they are maintained by physical factors perhaps associated with the 24-hour periodic rotation of the earth. Space flight now enables us to study this problem and sprouting potatoes were chosen because they show a definite rhythmicity in their uptake of oxygen related to their cycle of metabolic activities.

In a space experiment using a series of potato tuber plubs, the oxygen utilization rate is accurately measured and the rhythmic periodicity can be observed with the data on oxygen consumption telemetered back to earth. It is planned to put this potato experiment into Apollo earth-orbiting spacecraft and into Pioneer spacecraft with an interplanetary trajectory to escape all influence of the earth's rotation.

Mr. President, this is no "pie-in-the-sky" dream. Instead, it is a "potato-in-the-sky" experiment, the result of which could mean the difference between life and death for our astronauts in future long flights.

PROPOSAL BY SENATOR CLARK FOR A CEASE-FIRE IN VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on Friday evening, March 31, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] made a highly significant proposal which deserves the careful attention of everyone concerned with bringing the Vietnam war to an honorable end. In proposing that the United States and the South Vietnamese commence a cease-fire on April 15, and that this be followed by efforts by the Geneva Conference co-chairmen, members of the International Control Commission, and Secretary-General U Thant to persuade the other side to do likewise, the Senator from Pennsylvania has set forth a thoughtful alternative to the present policy which promises only continued escalation.

Secretary-General U Thant broke his traditional custom of refusing comment on statements by Government officials by

immediately endorsing Senator CLARK's proposal. The Secretary-General said in his statement that:

It becomes ever more clear to me that this impasse can be broken and a halt put to the increasingly horrible slaughter and destruction of the Vietnam war only if one side or the other shows the wisdom and the courage and compassion for humanity to take the initiative on a first step—that is to say, by undertaking unilaterally to put the standstill truce into effect, and thereafter to fire only if fired upon.

The United States, with power and wealth unprecedented in human history, is in a position to take this initiative.

I hope that Senator CLARK's proposal will be given careful study by leaders of both sides who are in a position to stop the killing and bring the war to the negotiating stage.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the speech by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, an article published in New York Times of April 2, which includes the text of the statement by the Secretary-General, and an article published in the Washington Post of April 2, on the same subject.

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

TO END THE WAR IN VIETNAM; TO WIN THE WAR ON POVERTY

(Keynote address of Senator Joseph S. Clark, (D., Pa.), at the 20th annual meeting of the Americans for Democratic Action, Shoreham Hotel, Friday evening, March 31, 1967)

Twenty years ago Americans for Democratic Action came into existence to support the liberal policies of Franklin Delano Roosevelt whose memory we honor tonight. In its initial statement of purposes the first Board of Directors of ADA in addition to noting that "liberalism is a demanding faith" announced its support of Congressional Reform, Civil Rights, and liberalization of Social Security benefits. As our French friends put it "Plus c'a change, plus c'est la même chose."

Many of the founders of our organization are no longer with us and we miss them tonight: Eleanor Roosevelt, Herbert Lehman, Gardner Jackson, Elmer Davis, Walter White, A. Powell Davies, to name only a few. But many others whose spirit shaped ADA during those twenty critical years are still working in the liberal vineyard; some more actively than others, some more deeply in politics, others now on the side-line: Kenneth Galbraith, our next president, Wayne Morse, Joe Rauh, Paul Douglas, Francis Biddle, Helen Gahagan Douglas, John Roche, Jim Wechsler and, I dare to add Hubert Humphrey.

There are parallels in 1947 and 1967. Then, as now, we were a government in exile. Then, as now, the liberal cause had suffered a shattering defeat in the mid-term Congressional elections. Harry Truman, his honeymoon over, was at the depth of his unpopularity. Few indeed believed he could stage the magnificent comeback he made in 1948 to give the liberal cause a new lease on life.

The results of our own defeat last fall are all too apparent. The liberals in the House are pretty well snowed under. Whether we in the Senate, with an influx of new, forward-looking young Republicans can carry our share of the liberal load remains to be seen. The White House, preoccupied with the war in Vietnam, fights for liberal causes with something less than fervid zeal. A largely apathetic electorate is no more interested in the Great Society today than it was with Harry Truman's Fair Deal. What are our chances in 1968 of repeating the Truman

miracle and reviving the liberal spirit across the country?

I would be less than candid if I told you I thought the chances were good. What needs to be done seems clear enough. How to accomplish it is a more difficult task to analyze. But it is just the kind of task ADA was founded to perform.

A keynote address is not a laundry list. The Dictionary says the function of a keynote is to present the essential issues of interest to the assembly. But the spectrum of essential issues is wide indeed. I should like tonight to touch ever so lightly on some of these issues, but to concentrate in the end on two wars, the one in Vietnam far away in Southeast Asia, and the other right here at home, the War on Poverty.

Preliminarily, however, let me remind you that the only certain thing in the modern world is that life for all of us will be different tomorrow than it is today. 1967 is not 1947 though many of the important issues then are still with us now. This lesson we in ADA learned many years ago. Change is certain. Can our Democracy or, if you prefer, our Republic, adjust to it? I have a cautious optimism that it can—if we want it to badly enough.

Here are some of the problems which present themselves to us.

First, our whole structure of government—local, state, national, and international, is sagging under the heavy load constant change imposes on a framework intended for a simpler and more static world. As one example, the Senate of the United States has just made a conscious and basic decision to remain procedurally obsolete. It therefore remains incapable of meeting the challenges with which the modern world confronts it. The House is better, but not much. At least, in what we call "the other Body," majority rule, no matter how misguided, has a fair chance of prevailing. But, as Clayton Fritchey so wisely stated the other day, the Senate and the House are the least representative bodies of any free parliament anywhere in the world. And this is why we in Congress are so unresponsive to public needs.

Let me give you a few frightening statistics. America has become an urban nation—more than two-thirds of us now live in large metropolitan areas. Yet fifteen of the twenty chairmen of the powerful standing committees of the House come from small towns or rural areas. In the Senate only two of the sixteen committee Chairmen come from cities: Mike Monroney, who chairs the Post Office Committee is from Oklahoma City and Lister Hill of Labor and Public Welfare, from Montgomery, Alabama.

The median age of present-day Americans is twenty-eight, but among the House and Senate chairmen, it is 67.

Even from a stand-point of religion, Congressional leadership does not reflect modern America. In the House seventeen of the twenty chairmen are white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestants. In the Senate Allen Ellender from Catholic Louisiana is the only non-WASP who chairs a committee.

Geographically the former Confederate States of America, with one-fifth of the United States' population has nine out of sixteen chairmen in the Senate and eleven out of twenty in the House. And this does not count the border states which make the ratio worse. This is the seniority system in action.

As Congressman Dick Bolling said in the House the other day, "It is apparent that Congress is simply not organized to carry out its responsibilities nor to meet the expectations of the people." And the Monroney-Madden bill will not do much to help.

What to do about it? As I said earlier, the remedy is clear but how to effectuate it is more difficult. Here is a challenge to the leadership of ADA, a challenge, I might add, which your leaders have always been quick to take up. After all you've been at it for twenty years.

Second, what do we do about the "generational gap"? Senator Bob Kennedy and Arthur Schlesinger, addressing Roosevelt Day Dinners in Philadelphia and New York, pointed up the need to capture the loyalty of liberal youth. And I agree with them. Where are the young tonight? We must make way for young people in our leadership. We must persuade the youth of America that they can have a happy home with Americans for Democratic Action. Whatever the differences they may have with us, and there are many, whatever the depths of their dissent, we must make them feel that we in ADA agree that orderly political change is not only possible, it is essential to the survival of America as a great nation. We must persuade them that they will be heard, that we will join them in a war against the faulty procedures for decision making, the cruelties and follies and injustices of the world we live in. Their vigor, their optimism, their sensitivity, their imagination must be enlisted in our cause. Again it is easy to agree with the concept. The problem is, how do we carry it into effect?

As Joseph Kraft pointed out last Monday, the 1966 Congressional elections brought younger Republicans to the national scene but confirmed older Democrats in their dominance of Congress. Younger men who sought to rise in the Democratic Party found their road blocked. Thus disillusioned with us, they have been increasingly ready to go their own way. Some of them, as in my own City of Philadelphia, have already switched their Party allegiance.

The same thing is happening in labor, in the civil rights movement, in the intellectual community, particularly among the students. We cannot, we should not, exclude the young from our councils.

Third, what are the specific issues to which we in the ADA should address ourselves for the foreseeable future? Certainly water and air pollution control are two. They strike at the very survival of life in this country and we are doing precious little about either of them.

Crime, housing, the renewal of our cities, birth control, education, the arms race, disarmament, the frightening gap between the rich and poor nations, here are merely a few of the other problems whose prompt solution is demanded by constant change in a constantly shrinking world.

But the most important immediate issues in my judgment to which we in ADA should give the highest priority is how to end the war in Vietnam and how to win the War on Poverty at home.

We pride ourselves in this organization on our initiative and our vision in the pragmatic area of political action. What are we going to do to stop the war in Southeast Asia and win the war at home?

We escalate day by day the war in Vietnam at a shocking cost in young men maimed and killed, young men of many a nation, and, I might add, old women and children too. As the napalm and the guns and the bombing on our side destroy not only soldiers but civilians, men, women, and children, the terror and the mortars on their side take the lives of many a South Vietnamese village leader and his family as well as thousands of Americans and South Vietnamese. As I speak tonight, we seem committed to a course of seeking "all-out military victory", and I deliberately put those words in quotes, for if achieved this would be a Pyrrhic victory indeed. What price will we pay for the glory of marching triumphantly through a defoliated countryside and streets of burning ruins in both North and South Vietnam, monarchs of all that we survey. We will have achieved nothing but the destruction of a civilization different from our own. And the long, hard task of paying penance at enormous cost for the havoc we have created in the name of "national honor" and the "holy war against Godless communism" will

haunt the conscience of America for many a year.

To paraphrase MacBeth at the end of his career, Honor, love, obedience, troops of friends, we must not look to have; but in their stead, world-wide curses, not loud but deep, mouth honor which the poor heart would feign deny but dare not.

The guns boom loudly in the south and the bombs burst at a constantly greater rate in the air and on the ground in the north. On the one hand we are told by optimists that we are winning this cruel war and that if we hold out a little longer, victory will surely come. Yet, on the other hand, we are told that the war will be long and hard but we must stay the course so that in the end we can hang the coonskin on the wall.

Meanwhile, the casualty lists grow daily both on our side and among the Viet Cong and the troops of Hanoi. The more we kill the more they kill. Perhaps the height of cynicism was reached the other day when one of our generals, referring to the constantly increasing rate of American casualties, was quoted as saying, "This means we are doing a better job."

The War on Poverty is the war we are de-escalating day by day as we increase the tempo of the war in Vietnam. Once we were told we could win the war at home in ten years. Today, if we proceed to fund it as the Administration plans, it will take at least twice that long and possibly longer.

While we kill the enemy and send our finest young men to death in the jungles in Asia, we on the poverty war front are trying to save lives. The future of 35,000,000 Americans is at stake in this war at home. But while we spend \$24,000,000,000 a year or \$2,000,000,000 a month on the war in Vietnam, we will have difficulty in the Congress in authorizing the spending of the \$2,000,000,000 for an entire year which the President recommended for the continuation of OEO programs.

Put it another way. If we get the \$2,000,000,000 for the War on Poverty in fiscal 1968 and if the war in Vietnam costs another \$24,000,000,000, during the next fiscal year we will be spending some \$57 to improve the lot of each of the 35,000,000 impoverished Americans. But we will be spending \$48,000 for each of our 500,000 troops in Vietnam or \$1,500 for each of the 16,000,000 people in South Vietnam including the Viet Cong.

Incidentally, it is now costing us about \$400,000 for each Viet Cong we kill. And despite the high rate of casualties, there are many more Viet Cong in the field against us today than there were last year or the year before.

The Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty which I chair, recently completed its first week of hearings on the anti-poverty program. Competent witnesses agreed that the \$2,000,000,000 which the President has recommended for that part of the War on Poverty administered by Sargent Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity is entirely inadequate even though it is a 20% increase over what the President got last year. Programs all over the country have already been cut back. This summer things will be worse. Mayor Cavanaugh of Detroit, President of the United States Conference of Mayors and former President of the National League of Cities, testified that a minimum of \$3,000,000,000 would be required to keep the program moving ahead. Other responsible witnesses put the figure at \$4,500,000,000.

Representatives of the poor, directors of community action agencies, Erwin Canham, Chairman of the Task Force of the United States Chamber of Commerce and Andrew Bleimiller, representing the AFL-CIO, all agreed that we have barely scratched the surface of the poverty problem in the United States. Sargent Shriver has stated that of the 35,000,000 Americans now living in poverty, Office of Economic Opportunity pro-

grams have had some impact on only 4,000,000. How much of an impact we don't yet know. Many of the witnesses were critical of the operations and administration of the poverty program. But not one undertook to recommend that we make peace with poverty by quitting the war.

It is clear, of course, that Federal money alone will not solve the problems of poverty in the United States. There are many other complicated technical and human reasons why we have not done better than we have. But without adequate funding a real program is impossible. And today I despair of attaining adequate funding until the war in Vietnam is over.

We are just getting underway with our investigation of the poverty program. Next week we take off on a tour of ten states in the hope we can get helpful information from all over the country. We must find out what is wrong and what is right with the operations, so we can do our part in making all the programs more effective.

The cost of losing this War on Poverty is higher than many appreciate. It includes the continuing and growing blighting of whole cities and, more important, the blighting of millions of lives. This is a war we cannot afford to lose. It is the only war we should be escalating. To lose this war would be a far greater blot on our national honor than to lose the war in Vietnam.

That war, which few of us understand, is fought in a remote country of which many of us had not even heard a few years ago.

We are told this war is essential to the security of the United States. Well, I don't believe it. In my judgment our military leaders should never have taken us with ground troops onto the mainland of Asia. Our air and naval power could have shielded our legitimate South East Asia objectives from bases on the island chain running south from Japan through the Philippines to Australia and New Zealand. The security of the United States does not require one soldier in South Vietnam.

We are told we are fighting for freedom. But if we are fighting for freedom, what are we doing supporting General Ky?

We are told we are fighting the extension of Communism. But if American troops are necessary to prevent the expansion of Communism how does it happen that Indonesia threw out the Communists without an American soldier within a thousand miles; and how has Burma turned back the Chinese Communists while refusing economic aid and troops from the United States?

Are we the world's policemen? Why should not the Vietnamese, North and South alike, be permitted to determine in their own way what sort of government they want. And if you point with much truth to the cruelty and atrocities of the Viet Cong, must one not also look at the cruelty and atrocities of the South Vietnamese Army and the havoc wrought by American gunfire, bombs, lazy dogs and napalm on innocent Vietnamese?

What real danger is there of the Chinese Communists overrunning Vietnam? For a thousand years the Vietnamese have hated the Chinese and repulsed their every effort at conquest. China is presently in a state of economic and political chaos. Is there reason to believe they are capable of militarily overrunning any part of Vietnam, unless indeed we force them into war to defend their own country against attack as we did in Korea.

What we have done is to intervene in a civil war between two Vietnamese factions, neither of which has any interest in freedom and democracy as we use those terms. And if you suggest that the carefully screened constituent assembly which has just promulgated a new constitution for South Vietnam has taken a long or even an important step towards bringing freedom to that war-torn country, you will, I am sure, permit me a healthy scepticism. General Ky and his

junta are still in the saddle—voters in the coming election will be carefully screened.

And so I am compelled to ask, What Price Glory? And I would suggest that the price is high, too high for us to pay.

I say so for the following reasons:

First, the thought, energies, and spirit of the leaders of our government are so absorbed with Vietnam that they have little time for anything else. Second, until the shooting stops in Vietnam there is little chance that we can make meaningful progress in establishing that detente with the Soviet Union which is so essential to peace and to the well-being of the peoples of both countries. Third, all efforts to bring Communist China into the company of civilized nations at the U.N. and elsewhere are bogged down by the war. Fourth, forward movement towards improving the structure of the U.N. and its ability to establish and maintain the peace of the world has practically come to a halt because of the war and the international animosities it has aroused. Fifth, the traditional tug-of-war between the Executive and the Congress has been exacerbated. Sixth, the public image of the United States has been changed from a benevolent Uncle Sam seeking to do more than his share in curing the ills of the world, to a power-hungry imperialist bent on establishing by force of arms a Pax Americana. Seventh, the efforts to balance our international payments and to protect our gold supply have been crippled, if not killed. Eighth, as of March 11, 1967, according to the Department of Defense, 8075 Americans have been killed in Vietnam since January 1, 1961, a large majority of them in 1966 and 7. 46,728 more have been wounded. These figures do not include those afflicted with malaria, dysentery, hepatitis, bubonic plague and other jungle diseases, which may last for life. The carnage continues and amounts in intensity each month. Ninth, but perhaps the highest price of all, is the brutalization of human nature and the turning aside of our aspirations for man caused by the war. Primitive instincts for combat have been revived by the daily statistics of the number of Viet Cong and North Vietnamese troops killed in the last 24 hours. Watching the war on T.V. has become a popular spectator sport. Seeing young men killed and old women burned is a common place in the living rooms of millions of Americans. Clamor in the country for "getting it over with quickly through the unrelenting use of military power, including nuclear weapons" rises daily. The military-industrial complex rides high. Advocates of arms control and disarmament have taken to the fall-out shelters. In such an atmosphere, one must attest to the validity of Alexander Pope's phrase, "The greatest enemy of mankind is man".

I have not been one who has advocated unilateral withdrawal by the United States from Vietnam. It is too late for that and too many people have committed their lives and fortunes to the American cause. But I would certainly aim our course at a negotiated settlement from which might result a neutral Vietnam, North and South alike.

Secretary General U Thant of the United Nations has taken a useful initiative in this direction with his three-point proposal of a general stand-still truce, preliminary talks and reconvening of the Geneva Conference. The United States has accepted these suggestions. Hanoi has rejected them, possibly because they do not call for negotiations with the Viet Cong until after the truce has been established and preliminary talks between the U.S. and North Vietnam, have taken place. Hanoi has always insisted that it does not control the Viet Cong and that cessation of the bombing of the North is an essential prerequisite to negotiations.

The time has come, in my judgment, to cut through the technicalities. A general standstill truce can be accomplished without

preliminary negotiations. The best way to get it is for the U.S. to make the first move.

I suggest our Government promptly announce that on April 15 it will:

1. Cease the bombing of North Vietnam.
2. Cease all offensive operations in South Vietnam, firing only if fired upon.
3. Induce General Ky's forces to do the same.

We should then invite the assistance of U Thant, the Geneva Co-chairman and the members of the ICC in persuading both Hanoi and the Viet Cong to promptly follow suit. If they respond, we are on our way to peace. If not, we should, in any event, first, stop the bombing in the North; second, stop the search and destroy policy so costly in American lives; third, shore ourselves up in easily defensible positions, sallying out perhaps from time to time to protect the perimeter from mortar fire.

And then we would say to our enemies: "We do not wish to stay in Vietnam. We are prepared to get out as soon as you stop the shooting and work out with us a sensible and neutral solution to this terrible problem. You cannot win a military victory; neither can we. Both of us had better find a way to get out of this with mutual self-respect."

I have some confidence that under these proposals we would soon be at the conference table with the shooting stopped and an end to the war in sight.

And then I would turn some small part of the billions of dollars saved to winning that other war, the War on Poverty, the war to which every ounce of American idealism and determination should be directed—the war which is essential to our national security, the war which is our best domestic weapon against the inroads of Communism, the war which is a war in support of social, political, and economic freedom, and the war, which once won, will leave in its wake, "no worldwide curses, not loud but deep," but will earn us the justified plaudits of the entire world—and perhaps the credit, in history of being the generation which eliminated misery in America.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 2, 1967]

THANT URGES U.S. DECLARE A HALT IN VIETNAM WAR—APPEALS FOR UNILATERAL STEP IN HOPE THAT THE ENEMY WILL FOLLOW PATTERN—NO COMMENT IN CAPITAL—BUT AIDS SEE A PARALLEL TO HANOI TERMS—U.N. CHIEF PRAISES CLARK'S PLAN

(By Sam Pope Brewer)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., April 1.—Secretary General Thant made a public appeal today to the United States to declare a unilateral cease-fire in Vietnam in the hope that North Vietnam and the Vietcong would follow suit.

Mr. Thant called on the United States to say that it would declare a truce and "thereafter fire only if fired upon." He said he believed that any risk this would involve for the United States would be limited.

The Secretary General said it had become clear to him that only such a move by one side or the other could end "the increasingly horrible slaughter and destruction of the Vietnam war."

He declared that while his last appeal on March 14 was directed equally to both sides, he believed that it was the United States alone, "with power and wealth unprecedented in human history," that was in a position to take a unilateral initiative for peace.

APRIL 15 DATE PROPOSED

Mr. Thant based his appeal on a statement made yesterday by Senator Joseph S. Clark at the national convention of Americans for Democratic Action in Washington. The Pennsylvania Democrat said the time had come for the United States to take up Mr. Thant's truce proposals by halting all offensive action, including the bombing of North Vietnam, on April 15.

"A general standstill truce can be accom-

plished without preliminary negotiations," Mr. Clark said. "The best way to get it is for the United States to make the first move."

Mr. Thant said he was breaking his rule against commenting on positions taken by officials of member governments because he was so impressed by Senator Clark's proposals made in Washington in a speech before Americans for Democratic Action.

Arthur J. Goldberg, the chief United States representative at the United Nations, said tonight that he did not consider Mr. Thant's statement as either a proposal or an appeal.

PREVIOUS RESPONSE CITED

"We have already responded affirmatively to the Secretary General's latest proposal contained in his aide-memoire of March 14, and we stand by that response," Ambassador Goldberg said.

In Johnston City, Tex., where President Johnson is spending the weekend, a White House spokesman said the President had no comment on Mr. Thant's statement.

The State Department also declined comment. But department officials privately recalled that Mr. Thant's proposal paralleled North Vietnamese demands. Such demands have been countered by American insistence that Hanoi reciprocate for any halt in United States air attacks by scaling down its military activity.

Officials also said that by directing such an appeal to Washington, the Secretary General was in effect diluting his recent three-stage peace formula that called for "a general standstill truce" to be carried out by all sides.

Earlier today, as he arrived at the United Nations, Mr. Thant had said that the next practical step toward peace talks in Vietnam should be the proposal to all governments involved of a specified date and hour for a "standstill truce."

Speaking with newsmen, Mr. Thant said this move should not be delayed by questions of truce terms or controls.

DEFINITION PROVIDED

Asked through a spokesman later what he meant by "a standstill truce," Mr. Thant sent back word that it was "a cessation of bombing and all other hostilities, with all forces remaining in position where they are when it becomes effective."

He emphasized in his conversation this morning that he still considered the first prerequisite to peace negotiations an end to United States bombing of North Vietnam before anything else was discussed.

The Secretary General said today that in more than a year there had been no effective action on his "three-point plan" to end the war. It was for this reason that he restated the plan in slightly different terms Tuesday, he declared. The end of the bombing is no longer given as one of the three steps but is stated separately as a prerequisite.

Mr. Thant listed the other points as "(a) a general standstill truce, (b) preliminary talks, and (c) reconvening of the Geneva conference."

A reconvening of the Geneva conference that was supposed to have established peace in Indochina in 1954 has been opposed by the Soviet Union, which was one of the co-chairmen. Britain, as the other co-chairman, has appealed several times for a new meeting.

Mr. Thant specified today that the truce in the fighting in South Vietnam must not be conditioned on supervision or control. He has said before that there are bound to be breaches of any unsupervised truce but that if the parties really wish agreement, such violations should not cause a breakdown of negotiations.

His proposals, made in an aide-memoire to interested governments on March 14, received quick but slightly qualified approval from the United States.

Hanoi is reported to have rejected them,

but, according to diplomatic sources here, Mr. Thant did not consider that rejection final.

Nguyen Duy Lien, South Vietnam's observer at the United Nations, made public his government's "agreement in principle" here yesterday. It was interpreted by diplomats as giving Mr. Thant ground for a new approach to Hanoi.

However, Saigon's letter asserted that "a military truce cannot be effective without prior agreement on details and control."

Mr. Thant had been saying precisely the opposite—that if the simple principle is adopted that everyone must stop all fighting at a specified moment, the details of control or supervision can be dealt with later. He has said repeatedly that results were achieved at the Geneva conference while fighting was still going on.

Mr. Thant's plan appears to propose bypassing Saigon in the first stage of the preliminary talks of a new Geneva conference. But Saigon and Washington both have indicated that South Vietnam would have to be heard at all stages.

STATEMENT BY THANT

Statement issued by Secretary General Thant:

"It is my custom to refrain from public comment on positions taken publicly by officials of any government. This statement, therefore, is most definitely an exception to the practice and is not to be taken as a precedent for the future.

I make this exception because I have been so greatly impressed by the statement made by Senator Joseph S. Clark in his speech to the national convention of the Americans for Democratic Action on 31 March.

My latest proposal was necessarily directed to both sides in the conflict and implicitly called for simultaneous action with regard to the standstill truce by the two sides. Nevertheless, I recognize the harsh reality of the existing impasse. Indeed, this realization was the sole motivation for my latest proposal.

"But it becomes ever more clear to me that this impasse can be broken and a halt put to the increasingly horrible slaughter and destruction of the Vietnam war only if one side or the other shows the wisdom and the courage and the compassion for humanity to take the initiative on a first step—that is to say, by undertaking unilaterally to put the standstill truce into effect, and thereafter to fire only if fired upon.

"The United States with power and wealth unprecedented in human history, is in a position to take this initiative.

"I must say in all frankness that I share Senator Clark's view that the United States can afford to take such a step even though there is an admitted, but, in my opinion, limited risk for the United States in doing so."

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 2, 1967]

THANT CALLS FOR U.S. CEASE-FIRE AS START TOWARD VIET PEACE—SUPPORTS UNILATERAL ACTION PROPOSED BY SENATOR CLARK

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., April 1.—The United States should unilaterally declare a cease-fire in Vietnam as the first step toward peace, U.N. Secretary General U Thant said today.

Thant endorsed a similar proposal made by Sen. Joseph S. Clark (D-Pa.) in Washington yesterday at the opening of the convention of the Americans for Democratic Action.

MAKES EXCEPTION

The Secretary General told newsmen he customarily refrains from commenting on statements by Government officials, but was making an exception this time because he had "been so greatly impressed" by Clark's speech.

Clark told ADA delegates that the United States should, on April 15, stop bombing

North Vietnam, halt all offensive operations in South Vietnam and induce South Vietnamese military forces to do the same.

Clark said that Thant, the co-chairman of the 1954 Geneva Conference and members of the International Control Commission should then be able to persuade the North Vietnamese and Vietcong to stop fighting. He expressed confidence that "under these proposals we would soon be at the conference table, with the shooting war stopped."

URGES STANDSTILL

Thant said in a statement released today that the impasse in Vietnam can be broken "only if one side or the other shows the wisdom and the courage and the compassion for humanity to take the initiative on the first step—that is to say, by undertaking unilaterally to put the standstill truce into effect, and thereafter to fire only if fired upon."

"The United States, with power and wealth unprecedented in human history, is in a position to take this initiative. I must say in all frankness that I share Sen. Clark's view that the United States can afford to take such a step even though there is an admitted, but in my opinion, limited risk for the United States in doing so."

[In Washington, the State Department said it had no immediate comment on Thant's statement].

Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg, head of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations, said the United States stands by its earlier reply to Thant's call for a standstill truce, with talks between Washington and Hanoi to be followed by reconvening the Geneva Conference.

"We have been informed that the Secretary General's statement today is neither a proposal nor an appeal," Goldberg said. "We have already responded affirmatively to the Secretary General's latest proposal contained in his aide memoir of March 14."

Both the United States and South Vietnam have accepted Thant's three-stage plan, but Washington wanted talks on details of the truce to precede the cease-fire. South Vietnam expressed willingness to meet with North Vietnamese representatives, but made no mention of Washington-Hanoi talks or of meeting with the Vietcong.

Thant told newsmen today preliminary discussions of truce details "were out of the question."

"So long as the bombing is going on, there will be no talks as far as the North Vietnamese are concerned," he said. Thant had said Wednesday he had received a written reply from Hanoi to his latest peace plan, but did not hint at its content until today.

Thant is believed to have broached his three-part proposal to North Vietnamese representatives at a meeting early last month in Rangoon, when he visited his native Burma. Their response reportedly was not favorable then, but Thant maintained there had been no outright rejection.

Thant made his proposal for a standstill truce and talks between Washington and Hanoi after failing to win agreement on his 13-month-old plan that called for an end to U.S. bombing of North Vietnam, scaling down military activities on both sides in South Vietnam and discussions among all the participants, including the Vietcong.

HUEYCOBRA—THE ARMY'S NEW FIGHTING HELICOPTER

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the April 1967, issue of the Army Digest contains a most interesting article on the tactical use of the HueyCobra—the Army's new AH-1G fighting helicopter. I am proud that the copter is being manufactured in the city of Fort Worth by the Bell Helicopter people there. Mass production is due shortly for this

trim version of the UH-1 Iroquois, which has proved itself admirably in tests by the Army.

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

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

HUEYCOBRA—POISED TO STRIKE

THE ARMY'S NEW AH-1G FIGHTING HELICOPTER PROMISES MORE PUNCH FOR HELIBORNE OPERATIONS

(By Major Joseph N. Jagers, Jr.)

They call it the HueyCobra, this new AH-1G soon to be put into production. It's a slimmed, trimmed-down, fully armed version of the old reliable UH-1 Iroquois which itself is no mean fighting ship although its main job is carrying troops and cargo.

But this new HueyCobra—that's a helicopter of another Huey. It isn't intended for heavy hauling. It's to the Iroquois as a swift hornet is to a slower but still lethal bumblebee. It packs in its newly designed "fangs" the deadly poison of the king cobra.

Just what all this will mean in terms of warfare—of aerial support of ground missions and of aerial combat operations—is difficult to predict at this time. The new Army airmobile tactics using helicopters as instruments of mobility have been compared by some military thinkers with the Panzer tactics introduced by the Germans early in World War II. These exploited that full potential of land vehicles in combination with aerial delivery of supporting fires. The new Cobra compares with the German World War II JU87 Stuka aircraft—the famed dive bomber.

However, as with any new item of equipment, its full potential remains to be assessed only after considerable service experience has been marked up. The basic Cobra design offers possibilities for a wide variety of weapons and equipment and a broad range of missions. It can be pretty safely predicted that, considering experience gained with the armed Iroquois, the Cobra will broaden the scope and sharpen effectiveness of airmobile operations in what now is coming to be regarded as a "helicopter war."

The HueyCobra was designed and developed, and prototypes were produced, by Bell Helicopter Company engineers under an Army contract. As this is written, prototypes are undergoing extensive flight tests under direction of Army Materiel Command agencies. The first production models are scheduled for delivery and a buildup is to follow to provide machines for the training base and for operational units as swiftly as possible.

Utilizing the helicopter as an aerial weapons platform is new in the history of warfare. Experiments that began in 1955 at Army Aviation Center, Fort Rucker, Alabama, pointed the way for tactical and strategic concepts. Considerable experience in firing weapons from helicopters was gained by the French in their Algerian conflict, but large scale use of armed helicopters in ground combat support still had to be proved out.

First armed helicopter combat unit in the U.S. Army specifically organized for that purpose was the Utility Tactical Transport (UTT) Company stationed in Okinawa, and deployed in mid-1962 to Vietnam. Various weapons kits were developed and installed—or attached—to existing helicopters, mostly the Iroquois. Tactics developed by the UTT, using these jerry-rigged weapons platforms, are mostly still in use.

However, it was apparent that adding these weapons kits was a compromise that resulted in a dilemma. The armed helicopters were sent up to support and protect troop and cargo carrying elements. But addition of armament, especially externally mounted guns, reduced the maneuverability of the armed aircraft.

Studies by the Army and various industrial concerns led to the conclusion that the quickest way to achieve a meaningful improvement would be to modify an existing helicopter into an integrated weapons configuration.

In designing the Cobra it was decided to utilize and save the proven features of the existing Hueys—blades, transmission, engine—while modifying the fuselage to a streamlined enclosure that would carry a pilot and a gunner.

The cockpit would have to be engineered so that the crew could perform efficiently. It would have to allow a field of view that would correspond to their field of fire. And it would have to be armored to provide maximum protection. The machine would have to be designed to provide for effective delivery of a maximum payload of ammunition, would have to be extremely maneuverable, be designed for easy field maintenance, and be air transportable.

A look at the Cobra design shows that all these design requirements have been met. The new machine has utilized as far as possible the existing components of the UH-1; the cockpit is a marvel of efficiency; the two stubby wings or "fangs" plus the rotating flexible chin turret under the cockpit provide tremendously increased firepower; speed and maneuverability have been increased even over the UH-1; and more armor protection is provided for the crew. Smaller than the Iroquois, the HueyCobra is easily air transportable.

The turret carries the General Electric high rate of fire 7.62mm minigun. Some models are to be equipped with the XM-28 combination flexible turret developed by Emerson Electric Company which will carry a 40mm grenade launcher plus the minigun—or it can also be adapted for two miniguns or two of the grenade launchers.

Two rates of fire are provided for the minigun—1300 and 4000 rounds per minute. The grenade launcher, when installed, fires at a rate of 400 rounds per minute.

In the prototype models, the gunner controls the turret armament with a sight. Moving the sight directs the movement of the turret. The turreted weapons can also be fired by the pilot.

Early Cobras mounting the TAT-102A turret will have storage space in an ammunition bay for 8,000 rounds of 7.62 ammunition. Later models equipped with the XM-28 turret with one minigun and one grenade launcher will handle 7.62mm ammunition and grenades.

In the two stubby wings that mark a departure from older Huey configuration, the Cobra "poison" consists of a maximum of 76 2.75-inch rocket launchers in two "hard points." The wing armament may be jettisoned in flight.

For medium fire requirements, two M159 launchers are mounted in the wings. This configuration is expected to be useful for missions required a combination of speed and range with heavy ordnance load.

When the helicopter is to be used as aerial artillery, four M159 launchers mounted as wing stores will carry 76 rockets.

Armor protection is provided for the crewmen and for critical parts of the aircraft.

Standard instrumentation and avionics are installed in the cockpit. The pilot uses conventional controls; the co-pilot/gunner uses the "sidearm" or "arm-chair" backup system in case the pilot is incapacitated. This seating arrangement provides space for the turret sight.

As this is written, the HueyCobra tests have started at Fort Hood, Texas, where two phases of airworthiness are being conducted for the Army Aviation Command of St. Louis under contract to Bell Helicopter. The first phase consists of jettison tests of the external stores—that is, the rockets and gun parts mounted on the wings. Second phase consists of armament firing to measure ef-

fects of firing loads on the machine and to qualify the armament systems. Both are designed to insure that all portions of the armament system function properly and to obtain data from which the service life of components can be calculated.

When HueyCobra spits out its deadly fire in Vietnam, it's doubtful if any sort of oriental magic will be able to confine this Cobra to a basket or pull its "fangs."

PRAISE FOR SENATOR BROOKE'S FIRST SENATE SPEECH

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, shortly before the Easter recess, my friend, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], delivered his maiden address in the Senate. As Senators know, the speech was immediately hailed as a splendid pronouncement; strong but restrained, and with eloquence and conviction that is typical of the character and personality of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Among the many newspapers paying tribute to Senator BROOKE was the Washington Post, which asserted in a March 27 editorial that the speech was "as thoughtful, constructive, and responsive a critique as we have had from the Senate floor in a long time."

I thoroughly agree with the Post's comment and ask that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

HAWKS, HARES, AND DOVES

In the vernacular of Vietnam, public sentiment is supposed to divide neatly between the "hawks," who shout for more military action, and the "doves," who plead for instant peace. The maiden speech of Senator Brooke, the new Republican from Massachusetts, is eloquent testimony, if any is needed, that this is one of the crudest pieces of political shorthand ever applied to a problem which cries out for acceptance of its complexity. The Senator took the trouble to visit Vietnam and other Asian countries for a first-hand reappraisal, before speaking out. He returned to deliver as thoughtful, constructive and responsible a critique as we have had from the Senate floor in a long time.

For his pains, he was himself reappraised, with a good deal less care, and quickly reclassified. "Senate hawks have gained a new convert," one wire service reported. Other accounts celebrated the Senator's "reversal" from earlier calls for a halt in the bombing of North Vietnam, to "support" of the war effort in general, and the policies of President Johnson in particular.

The fact is that the Senator's "reluctant" conclusion that the bombing should be continued was not a "reversal" of anything. According to his aides, he had never recommended that it be stopped. What he had done earlier was question whether it was a help or a hindrance in promoting negotiations. From his own soundings, and in the light of the publication of the Johnson-Ho Chi Minh letters, he decided the pressure of continued bombing was still needed. Some of his other conclusions lend themselves still less to hawk-or-dove labels. He warned against further escalation; projected a struggle that could last another decade; rejected the proposition, accepted by most Administration policy-makers, that Vietnam must be defended in order to "ward off tomorrow's war somewhere else." He saw the war in terms of the people of Vietnam and found the most promise in ultimate "national reconciliation" between the warring factions in the South, specifically including the National Liberation Front.

If resort must be had to wild-life imagery, Senator Brooke is neither hawk nor dove. He is more like a tortoise, patiently prepared to stay the course, by contrast with those who would hare off after quick solutions, either through wider war or easy settlement terms. You might call him a turtle dove.

But better, perhaps, to abandon this Noah's Ark approach to foreign policy, and simply call Senator Brooke a welcome addition to the ranks of those who are perplexed enough to shun pat answers, concerned enough to modify their views in the light of fresh evidence, intelligent enough to approach a complex problem in complex terms. We are not likely to find a sound way out of Vietnam unless we learn to talk about it intelligibly.

GOLD PRODUCTION

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, in 1934 the price of gold was set at \$35 an ounce. Since that time the price of almost everything else has risen substantially. But, today in 1967, the price of gold remains at \$35 an ounce, the price fixed by the Government.

Naturally, with increases in the cost of labor, the cost of machinery, and the cost of living in general over the past three decades, hundreds of gold miners in the United States have been forced out of business. In 1963, American gold production fell to the lowest point of any peacetime year in more than a century.

Since 1963, there has been a minor gain in our gold production figures but the overall picture for American gold mining is still one of a severely depressed industry. My home State of Idaho, for example, used to furnish significant quantities of gold each year. This production has been reduced to a trickle. Idaho produced 150,000 ounces of gold in 1941. Last year, 1966, the State's gold output declined to a record low of about 4,000 ounces.

While our domestic gold production has been falling, U.S. consumption has continued at a high rate, last year amounting to three times the gold we produced. At a time when we are faced with a critical balance-of-payments problem, America finds itself largely dependent upon imports of gold.

Since 1948, Members of the Congress who recognize the crisis in domestic gold mining have introduced over 130 bills to help get the industry back on its feet. Not one of these measures has ever come to a vote. None have been voted on because every administration has held that any action tampering with the Government-fixed price of gold would produce international monetary chaos.

Therefore, in recent years in order to try to stimulate gold production, bills have been designed to provide incentive subsidies to domestic producers while leaving the magical \$35-an-ounce figure alone. However, the Treasury Department has opposed even these proposals on the ground that such subsidies would establish a two-price system implying recognition by the United States of gold prices higher than the official rate, causing a loss of confidence in the dollar and disrupting international trade and payments.

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee emphatically disagrees with this gloomy projection. The committee has stated, in effect, that Ameri-

can gold miners have been victimized by Government policy and that equity demands these citizens be given an opportunity to attain relief from Government discrimination against them. The committee has noted that the administration inconsistently supports the search for gold through direct Government activity in the heavy metals program and through subsidy to individuals in the Office of Minerals Exploration program, yet claims that differential payments to producers would bring disaster.

Three bills for incentive payments to producers have been reported to the Senate: S. 2125 in 1963, S. 1377 last year, and S. 49 this year. After S. 2125 and S. 1377 were reported, no further action was taken on them in the Senate. I sincerely hope that S. 49, with the bipartisan sponsorship of 20 Senators, does not suffer the same fate.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, in its role as overseer of American mining and minerals policies, strongly recommends the enactment of this latest proposal. Surely the time has come for the Senate to discuss the issue.

Nowhere in S. 49 is the word "price" mentioned. The bill is an outright production incentive measure. It aims at stimulating the output from both old and new domestic gold mines and providing a measure of relief to the miners who have been the victims of harsh Government policy. It would simply authorize payments to American producers based on the difference in the cost of gold production in the last quarter of 1939 and the costs of production today on an individual mine basis. New gold mines would qualify for aid through the establishment of constructive costs taking into account costs in nearby mining districts in the last quarter of 1939.

This measure is designed as a purely domestic program under the Secretary of the Interior and makes no reference to monetary aspects which are the responsibility of the Treasury Department.

In order that Senators may understand the sentiment of a once-important gold mining region about this issue, I submit House Joint Memorial No. 5, passed by the Idaho Legislature on March 3, 1967, for their consideration. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

H.J.M. No. 5

BY STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

A joint memorial to the Honorable President of the United States, and the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

We, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, respectfully request that:

Whereas, domestic gold producers, since 1934, have been required by law to sell their product to the Federal Government at the established price of \$35 per ounce, and

Whereas, the costs of producing this precious metal have continued to increase at an alarming rate due to the impact of inflation on gold mining and milling operations, with the result that virtually all gold producers in the United States have closed down their properties, and

Whereas, domestic gold production has declined sharply, from approximately

5,000,000 ounces in 1940 to a current annual rate of slightly more than 1,500,000 ounces, while current domestic gold consumption for defense, space and industrial requirements, for the arts and crafts and for dental use has increased rapidly to a current rate of approximately 6,000,000 ounces per year, more than three times our U.S. production rate, and

Whereas, the impact of this cost-price squeeze in Idaho has been even more severe, with production in 1966 reaching a new record low of about 4,000 ounces, as compared with a recent high of 150,000 ounces in 1941, and

Whereas, the persistent outflow of gold resulting from failure to solve our balance-of-payments deficit continues to be of increasingly grave national concern, and

Whereas, the growing disparity between domestic consumption and production imposes a substantial additional drain upon the monetary gold reserves of the United States, and

Whereas, Federal relief legislation revitalizing the U.S. gold mining industry could well terminate this continuing substantial depletion of our monetary gold reserves to supply U.S. internal domestic consumption and thus alleviate to some extent the concern in foreign circles over our monetary policies, and

Whereas, such legislation to stimulate domestic gold production is clearly in the national interest and would unquestionably revive and reactivate Idaho's latent gold potential;

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Thirty-ninth Session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session, the Senate and the House of Representatives concurring, that we respectfully request the President and the Congress of the United States to provide Federal financial assistance payments to domestic gold producers to stabilize the few existing U.S. gold properties, to reopen dormant gold mines, and to encourage aggressive exploration for new gold ore reserves in this country.

Be It Further Resolved, that the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this Memorial to the President of the United States, to the leadership of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Idaho congressional delegation.

This joint memorial passed the house on the 25th day of February, 1967.

PETE T. CENARRUSA,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This joint memorial passed the senate on the 3rd day of March, 1967.

JACK M. MURPHY,

President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial No. 5 originated in the House of Representatives during the Thirty-ninth Session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

DRYDEN M. HILER,

Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

REMARKS BY SENATOR DIRKSEN ON OCCASION OF ELECTION OF FREDERICK B. DENT AS PRESIDENT OF AMERICAN TEXTILE MANUFACTURERS INSTITUTE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, over the weekend our minority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], made some noteworthy and pertinent remarks in addressing the annual convention of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute at Miami Beach, Fla. The minority leader called for a congressional in-

vestigation into the administration of our trade laws before any new authority is given the executive branch through extending or passing new trade agreement legislation.

He also called particular attention to the increasing problems besetting the domestic textile industry as a direct result of spiraling imports from foreign countries in cotton, manmade, and woolen fibers. I was particularly impressed with his strong emphasis on the lack of reciprocity in our trade agreements with foreign countries. He asked this most important question:

Can you call it reciprocity when some 50 countries have virtually excluded importation of U.S. textiles by creating various types of barriers? Rather than relying on tariffs and quotas alone, many of these countries have developed a whole series of non-tariff gimmicks which for practical purposes exclude imports.

The textile industry is a prime example of how well-intentioned aid and trade programs are threatening to undercut an essential and vital American industry, with four million employees dependent upon it directly or indirectly.

Mr. President, I salute our distinguished minority leader on his keen insight into the problems now being multiplied on an ever-increasing scale by the improper administration of our trade laws. I am particularly grateful that one of our national leaders who does not represent a textile-producing area should be so concerned about the adverse effects our current trade policies are having on a domestic industry, which is important not only to the Southeast and Northeast but to the economy of the entire Nation.

Also, Mr. President, it is with much pride that I invite the attention of Senators to the election at this same convention of one of South Carolina's most outstanding citizens to the high position of president of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute. He is Mr. Frederick B. Dent, of Arcadia, S.C., the president of Mayfair Mills. Mr. Dent is one of the most capable business executives in this country. Above all, he is a man of the highest integrity and character, and is admired and respected by all who know him.

The textile industry, manufacturers and employees alike, are most fortunate to have his services in this key position of leadership at a time when this industry's survival is threatened by unfair and damaging import competition.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article concerning the annual meeting of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, published in the Columbia State-Record for Sunday, April 2, 1967.

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

SOUTH CAROLINA MAN WILL HEAD ATMI

HOLLYWOOD, Fla. (AP).—Sen. Everett Dirksen, R-Ill. told textile executives Saturday that a careful investigation of the administration of U.S. trade laws should be conducted.

Speaking at the annual meeting of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, the Senate minority leader said the investigation should be completed before any consideration is given to renewal of enlargement

of the President's authority to negotiate trade agreements.

The ATMI, at its closing convention session, elected Frederick B. Dent, of Arcadia, S.C., as president, succeeding William J. Erwin of Danville, Va.

Harold W. Whitcomb of Spray, N.C., was named first vice president, and Charles F. Myers Jr. of Greensboro, N.C., second vice president.

New directors elected are: James A. Chapman Jr., Inman, S.C.; Lewis S. Morris, Greensboro, N.C.; Howard Richmond, New York; Robert A. Bendheim, New York; Morris M. Bryan Jr., Jefferson, Ga.; Ernest J. Chornyei, Westerly, R.I.; and Robert T. Davis Jr., Columbus, Ga.

"We have reached the point where more and more of our domestic industries are finding it impossible to compete with foreign imports," Dirksen said.

"No one can be expected to compete with countries like Japan and Hong Kong where the average hourly wage scale in textiles is 36 and 25 cents, respectively. Yet, these highly industrialized countries account for nearly half of our textile and apparel imports."

Dirksen called for a "basic overhaul of our foreign trade machinery to make it do a better job of serving the needs of American industry and labor as well as people in foreign countries."

He added that U.S. trade laws are outmoded and no longer serve the purposes for which they were designed.

"A study of U.S. foreign trade data for recent years," he said, "prompts the conclusion that the United States has not received actual reciprocity in trade benefits."

"Can you call it reciprocity when some 50 countries have virtually excluded importation of U.S. textiles by creating various types of barriers? Rather than relying on tariffs and quotas alone, many of these countries have developed a whole series of non-tariff gimmicks which for practical purposes exclude imports."

He added, "The textile industry is a prime example of how well-intentioned aid and trade programs are threatening to undercut an essential and vital American industry, with four million employees dependent upon it directly or indirectly."

Robert C. Jackson, ATMI's executive vice president, said in his annual report that import trends "have made it clear that the level of imports will be a controlling factor in the future size and structure of the U.S. textile industry."

Jackson added that the industry has an obligation to grow because of its responsibilities to the military, to agriculture and to public and private institutions.

AWARD TO DENNIS HOOVER, DALLAS MORNING NEWS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, Mr. Dennis Hoover, of the Dallas Morning News, has been awarded second place in the single-story category of the American Trucking Association's Newspaper Safety Writing Competition. Mr. Hoover will formally be presented with his award on April 6, in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that the article which received this commendation be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEADLY DRIVERS—LICENSED TO MURDER

(By Dennis Hoover)

Meet a killer.

One day last fall, the police record shows, he ran his car through a red light, smashed into another car and sent its driver to the undertaker's.

This tragedy, like many others that made 1965 the bloodiest traffic year in Dallas history, was almost inevitable.

The red-light runner, age 40, had a long history of lawless driving. For years, "D-E-A-T-H" had been scrawled across his lengthening dossier at the Department of Public Safety like a neon warning sign.

Here are the key entries on his official record:

1943—Failure to yield the right-of-way.
1952—Driving while intoxicated.
1953—License suspended for 6 months.
1953—Driving while intoxicated.
1954—License suspended for a year.
1956—Speeding.
1957—Speeding.
1957—Accident.
1957—Illegal passing.
1958—Suspension re-established.
1958—Speeding.
1958—Speeding.
1958—Speeding.
1959—Illegal turn.
1960—Speeding.
1961—Accident.
1961—Speeding.
1961—Speeding.
1962—Speeding.
1962—Accident.
1964—Driving while intoxicated.
1964—License suspended for a year.

Then came the fatal accident. A check with the Department of Public Safety disclosed that this individual is again legally driving. His license was re-issued four months after the fatality.

Many other killer drivers of 1965 had similar records of flagrant recklessness. Chronic law violators accounted for a large portion of Dallas' 124 traffic dead.

Of the 115 drivers whom police deemed at fault in most of the deadly smashups, 15 had no prior violations. Twelve had no driver's license and four were licensed in other states, hence had no records on file at the D.P.S. One hit-and-run driver was not apprehended.

Of the remaining 83 drivers, one had 27 prior violations. One had 20. One had 19. Three had 18. Two had 15. One had 14, one 13, one 12. Two had 11, two 10.

Five of the drivers had 9 prior violations. Four of them had 8, four 7. Ten had 6. Eleven had 5. Eleven had 4. Eleven had 3. Six had 2, and six had 1.

Between themselves, the 84 drivers with prior known records had 547 traffic arrests, an average of 6½ each.

Small wonder the Dallas Citizens Traffic Commission recently announced plans to press for revision of the state driver license law. Declared C.T.C. President W. H. (Bill) Pierce:

"This law needs to be re-written so as to plug loopholes through which wanton violators continue to drive and endanger the lives and property of others. Provisions should be made in the new law to remove totally unqualified drivers from our streets and highways and to have periodic examination of all drivers."

Thirty-four of last year's traffic dead were pedestrians. Many were children with immature judgment, and aging persons whose alertness has faded. They walked where they shouldn't and paid with their lives.

But did the drivers do everything they could to avoid these accidents? In many cases the prior records of pedestrian killers indicate these motorists are devil-may-care, drunken or inept types who aren't likely to be driving with proper lookout for emergencies.

Some cases in point:

A 5-year-old boy was knocked into eternity while crossing a busy street against a red light. Police calculated that the death car was exceeding 32 m.p.h. at the time of the collision.

This driver had quite a record. In the previous 18 months he'd been in three mo-

tor vehicle accidents. He'd been ticketed once for speeding and twice for driving the wrong way on 1-way streets. His license had once been suspended six months for habitual traffic law violation.

Another motorist who killed an unwary child had been charged twice with driving while intoxicated, received two speeding tickets, two tickets for illegal turns and one for driving without a license.

Still another driver who hit a jaywalking pedestrian had been cited 27 times for traffic law violations over a 17-year period. Here is his official record:

1948—Ran a stop sign.
1949—Illegal turn.
1950—Illegal turn.
1950—Ran a red light.
1950—Illegal passing.
1950—Illegal turn.
1950—Ran a red light.
1950—Accident.
1950—Ran a stop sign.
1950—Accident.
1951—Ran a stop sign.
1951—Speeding.
1951—Ran a red light.
1951—Illegal turn.
1952—Wrong way on a 1-way street.
1954—Accident.
1955—Speeding.
1956—Speeding.
1957—Speeding.
1957—Negligent collision.
1958—Speeding.
1959—Illegal turn.
1959—Accident.
1960—Speeding.
1962—Speeding.
1962—Illegal turn.
1962—Ran a red light.
1962—Accident.

Then came the fatal episode. Ten days later, this motorist was involved in a motor vehicle collision—bringing his total to eight accidents. The D.P.S. says he still has his driver's license.

Police said the driver in another pedestrian killing was traveling at an "excessive speed." In the previous seven years this motorist had been ticketed twice for speeding, three times for running red lights, once for running a stop sign, twice for lacking a driver's license and once for negligent collision. Then his license was suspended for two months for habitually ignoring traffic laws. After his license was restored he accumulated seven more speeding tickets and one ticket for running a stop sign.

So thick are chronic traffic law violators on Dallas streets they frequently meet each other in fateful collisions.

In one case a young driver, by his own admission, was hitting 70 m.p.h. when he struck another car going through an intersection. A passenger in the second car was killed. The 70 m.p.h. driver had five speeding tickets and a motor vehicle accident on his record before the fatal wreck. The driver of the second car, had a record indicating he, too, was anything but safety-conscious.

He'd been charged six times with driving while intoxicated, had two tickets for running lights, been in two previous accidents and been caught three times driving without a license. His license had been suspended seven times for periods of six months to a year.

In another crash, a woman on the wrong side of the road collided with a car driven by a man. The man was killed. The woman had three prior accidents and been cited once for speeding, again for running a stop sign and again for illegal backing. The man, however, had 17 black marks on his driving record: 8 speeding, 2 accidents, 3 running a red light, 2 running a stop sign, 1 illegal turn and 1 no driver's license.

A 3-car smashup occurred when a motorist ran a stop sign. He'd previously received 19 traffic tickets, including 15 for speeding. The driver of a second car, who was killed, had within the last year been

cited twice for speeding, once for making an illegal turn and been in an accident. The third driver had on his record one prior accident, three arrests for speeding and one for running a stop sign.

Time and again, the bloody records show, people with a penchant for lawless driving asserted their right to the right-of-way regardless of the risk.

Drunken driving was clearly to blame in several of last year's fatalities. In one furious collision a sodden motorist was killed, but his male companion lived to give police an astounding statement. Here it is, with a fictitious name substituted for the real name of the deceased:

"Billy and myself got off work . . . and drove off . . . to a liquor store . . . I bought six bottles of beer and Billy bought six bottles of beer. We drank this beer and Billy went back . . . and bought a half pint of whisky. We sat in the car and drank this half pint and Billy went back . . . and bought another half pint of whisky which we sat in the car and drank.

"We were both pretty tight by this time and Billy suggested that we go for a ride . . . Billy drove . . . All of a sudden he stopped and made a U-turn and started driving back . . . We were approaching (an intersection) and he was driving about 40 to 50 miles per hour. I knew there was a stop sign ahead and when Billy didn't slack his speed, I told him, 'Billy, there is a stop sign right ahead.'

"Billy didn't pay any attention to me, so I repeated this two or three times. By this time we were entering an intersection . . . I caught a glance of a car entering the intersection from out of the left side of Billy's car. I don't know what our car did until it came to a stop. I got out of the car and saw that Billy was pinned under the left side . . ."

The deceased had an out-of-state license, hence his record is unavailable. The record of the other driver had 12 prior entries over a period 18 years: 9 speeding, 1 racing, 1 running a red light and 1 accident.

A remarkable number of fatal crashes last year involved only one car. The drivers lost control, ran off the road and overturned, or plowed into expressway light poles, bridge railings, concrete overpass pillars and other fixed objects. In a majority of these instances, too, the motorist had long been flirting with death—their's or somebody else's.

One aged motorist had been leading a charmed life. So had people who encountered him in Dallas traffic. His D.P.S. record shows 14 accidents in one of which he struck a pedestrian. Two additional entries were for running red lights and one was for ignoring a stop sign. In his last mishap he broke his neck and died when his car careened off a road shoulder and overturned.

A young driver had 20 entries on his D.P.S. record, including 9 speeding tickets and 4 accidents, when fate caught up with him. His car skidded on a freeway and bashed into a concrete pillar. He died instantly.

Nobody knows why another car wound up wrapped around a utility pole. Its aged driver was dead at the end of a dangerous trail of 15 moving traffic violations.

It was a street light pole that finally undid another motorist, a man in his 50's. Previously he'd accumulated this record:

1951—Accident.
1954—Speeding.
1955—Speeding.
1956—Ran a red light.
1957—Accident.
1957—Ran a stop sign.
1957—Driving on the wrong side of the street.
1957—Ran a red light.
1960—Driving on the wrong side of the street.
1962—Accident.
1962—Illegal turn.
1964—Accident.

1964—Accident.

1965—Accident.

Another driver survived five previous accidents before killing himself. He'd also been charged twice with driving while intoxicated. When he lay broken and bleeding against a concrete bridge support his corpse smelled of alcohol, the investigating officer wrote in his report.

In its analysis of Dallas' traffic catastrophe of 1965, the C.T.C. pointed out:

"Most of the drivers involved had long driving records indicating they had nothing but contempt for the laws enacted to save lives . . . the biggest contributing factor to all of our accidents is attitude."

The grisly 1965 record is replete with instances in which death car drivers had been placed under license suspension—not only once but several times—for repeat lethal behavior behind the wheel. Their licenses were restored, or they drove in defiance of suspension. They remained on the streets and highways until their murderous antics brought death, injury and sorrow.

Obviously, present laws and their enforcement are not clipping the wings of people whose records identify them as incurable motor maniacs.

The solution to much of the continuing traffic tragedy is clear.

If the public demanded it, sterner laws would be passed to revoke permanently the legal driving privilege of hardened traffic outlaws. Mandatory penitentiary terms could be provided for those who care to drive again.

PRIZE-WINNING ESSAY BY SHERMAN SMITH, CALDWELL, IDAHO

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped and the various Governors' committees in the States do an impressive job in promoting job opportunities for the many thousands of citizens in our society who, though handicapped, are capable of first-rate productive work. However, the national awareness of the great ability and potential of these citizens is still not all that it could be.

In order to heighten this awareness, the Ability Counts Essay Contest is conducted each year giving students a chance to emphasize for their elders the benefits of employing the handicapped. The winners of this contest from each State will be in Washington, D.C., later this month at which time a national winner will be announced.

I believe this undertaking is most worthwhile. I am very proud of this year's winner for Idaho, Sherman Smith, of Caldwell High School, Caldwell, Idaho. His essay, entitled "Handicapped Workers—Community Assets," focuses on the advantages of employing a handicapped person to the person himself, to other handicapped persons, and to the community at large—points we would all do well to remember. I ask unanimous consent that the prize-winning essay be printed in the RECORD.

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

HANDICAPPED WORKERS—COMMUNITY ASSETS (By Sherman Smith)

Shakespeare has told us that "the quality of mercy is twice blessed." I will paraphrase

Shakespeare to say that "the quality of independence through employment for a handicapped person is thrice blessed." This independence blesses the handicapped person, blesses the community, and blesses other handicapped persons.

One of the greatest sources of frustration and despair for the handicapped person is the feeling that he is a burden to his family, his friends, and his community. Often this despair will actually increase his handicap because it will hold him back from trying to overcome it. When a man is stripped of his pride and his feeling of self-sufficiency, his hopelessness can become a greater burden than his handicap. If the handicapped person can be trained to accomplish any kind of gainful task, he is given the greatest of gifts—the gift of hope. If he finds that he can be trained to do one task, he will have hope of performing increasingly more difficult tasks. The struggle to overcome his handicap will become a challenge, and he will not be so easily discouraged. Independence through gainful employment is a true blessing to the handicapped person. It restores his pride, takes away his feeling of frustration, and gives him hope.

Gainful employment of the handicapped blesses the community also. The most obvious blessing is economic. If the employed person is doing his part of the necessary tasks of the community, the community (or family as part of the community) does not have to assume responsibility for supporting this individual. But there is something beyond the economic aspect that blesses the community that observes a handicapped person taking his place in the productive life of the community. We can call it the inspirational aspect. Each time a person with two good legs or arms or eyes—a normal individual—sees a person at work who must overcome great obstacles to do that work, it becomes more difficult for that person to bemoan his own fate. His petty complaints about how hard his life is become ridiculous as compared to those of someone who has real difficulties to overcome. It should inspire one to make greater efforts to overcome his own handicaps which might be laziness, carelessness, or lack of education. The community can indeed be blessed by being inspired by a working handicapped person.

The third blessing is to other handicapped persons. These blessings form a never-ending chain of inspiration, since one successful example gives a glimmer of hope to another person similarly afflicted and he makes that first effort to achieve what has before seemed impossible to him. The person without a handicap has a difficult time telling a handicapped person what he can and should do. But the person who has already overcome the obstacles of hopelessness and helplessness can be the greatest source of inspiration and encouragement to a fellow handicapped person. As an example of the inspiration given to other handicapped workers, in one community a rancher, having lost both legs, continued to run his ranch from a hand-operated jeep. He also joined the planning commission and served his community there. His aggressive though sympathetic urging and his inspiring example soon had two other handicapped citizens out of their wheel chairs and into productive work.

Most people have a burning desire to succeed and be self-supporting. The handicapped person is no different from others in this respect, but he does have different problems to overcome in achieving success. The community needs to recognize these problems and do everything it can to help the handicapped overcome them. The greatest thing a community can do for a handicapped person is to provide training facilities and investigate the possibilities of employment for him. There is much prejudice about hiring a handicapped person that needs to be over-

come. There are some jobs that the handicapped person can do better than anyone else. The increased sensitivity of the senses of hearing and touch which a blind man develops make him very valuable in a position where these senses are important. Similarly, a deaf person's handicap becomes an asset when noise is a distracting or irritating factor on a job. The handicapped person should be given the opportunity to use his assets and prove his ability.

Most important is for the community to remember that an idle handicapped person is a liability but an employed handicapped person is an asset who gives inspiration to all who observe him.

POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS IN SOUTH KOREA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, a recent editorial published in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin called attention to the progress which South Korea has been making in its political and economic development and points out that "there are lessons in the earlier Korean experience that offer encouragement" in the war in Vietnam.

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:

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin
Mar. 15, 1967]

THE SOUTH KOREAN EXAMPLE

It was admirable planning that brought South Korean Premier II Kwon Chung to Philadelphia for a brief stay as the prelude to Washington and his talks with President Johnson. What more convenient, more restful, more thought-provoking place is there for a high foreign visitor to pause than here before taking on the ordeal of protocol and official pressure in the capital?

Here, where the nation was born, the visitor has the opportunity, afforded to Premier Chung in his visit to Independence Hall, to sense the simplicities of liberty to which the nation is dedicated. It is a meaningful experience in a period of world change and unrest. It can have particular significance to those who come from lands which, though they may be ancient, are full of new stirrings. The South Korean leader's sojourn should become part of a pattern.

Premier Chung, to be sure, is no stranger in America. Undoubtedly he knows our country better than we know his, despite the fact that a few years back the Korean war was almost as much of a bloody muddle for the United States as is the Vietnam war now.

Granting the dissimilarities in the two conflicts, there are lessons in the earlier Korean experience that offer encouragement in the present struggle and admonish us to patience and perseverance as well as to military prudence.

Mr. Chung's presence in the United States emphasizes two other points for us. One is that the South Koreans, whom America at great cost helped to resist aggression from the north, are now fighting in sizeable numbers by our side in Vietnam. The other is that once war-ravaged and, politically disordered South Korea has made tremendous progress toward recovery.

It is a strong ally, an important element in building a new balance of power in Asia, a part of what can be a regional arrangement that contributes to common security and greater prosperity for Asiatic peoples involved.

It is a land to whose further development the United States can contribute much as a matter of practical investment and with a feeling of affection and partnership.

¹ Shakespeare, W., *The Merchant of Venice*, Act. IV, Sc. 1

DEATH OF DR. META GLASS, EDUCATIONAL LEADER IN VIRGINIA

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, a great lady whose vitality and leadership have benefited the Commonwealth of Virginia and the Nation for more than half a century died recently at the age of 86, leaving a void in the lives of many thousands who knew her personally or knew of her outstanding achievements in her numerous fields of endeavor. Dr. Meta Glass—Miss Glass to so many—was best known as an educator, a president of Sweet Briar College for more than 20 years, and a president and longtime leader of the Association of American Colleges, the Association of Virginia Colleges, and the American Association of University Women. To refer only to her work in the field of education—as teacher, scholar, and administrator—would be to ignore the marvelous breadth of her interests and abilities. Miss Glass retired from the presidency of Sweet Briar in 1946, in spite of almost universal protests. She went on to serve the people of Virginia and the Nation in many diverse ways. I ask unanimous consent that two editorial commentaries on Miss Glass be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Norfolk-Portsmouth Virginian-Pilot, Mar. 23, 1967]

MISS GLASS

Miss Glass, we always called her—students and faculty too. She was president of Sweet Briar College and honored with degrees from many other colleges and universities. But on campus she was Miss Glass.

She was a doer—served in the Red Cross in World War I—and a scholar, and an administrator. The college grew under her hands, and goals she envisioned for intellectual and physical expansion have come to pass. Her successors have hewed to her line of progress.

Miss Glass was a handsome woman, with white hair and a Roman cast of face. She made a magnificent Queen Elizabeth on an Elizabethan May Day. She presided with dignity, and delicacy of language, at every college function. Formidable to a freshman perhaps, but, if the freshman survived to become a sophomore, a respected and loved person.

She was always accessible in her office or in Sweet Briar House, the 19th Century home of the Williams family that founded the college. It was and is the president's residence, surrounded by beautiful gardens of boxwood without rival, I believe, anywhere in Virginia.

Miss Glass was accustomed to invite in casual fashion students to lunch, or to dine with her on Sunday. Several times my roommate and I were her guests. We lunched and then had coffee on the second floor veranda of Sweet Briar House.

Carried away by the beauty of the garden stretching around us, on one such occasion I naively offered a large blue spruce from my parents' garden in Norfolk as a gift to the college's garden.

Miss Glass looked at me for a moment and then, with gravity, accepted my offer, which she must have known was fraught with difficulties and expense which neither my family nor the college could afford.

We then talked of anything and everything, and my roommate and I retired to our dormitory refreshed and restored for the next week's work.

She always took her turn with the faculty in the chapel service. Sometimes when she

read the lesson her voice would begin to tremble. So she would pause, firm up her lips, and continue, as poised as ever. It used to embarrass us a little; but now, I think, my college mates and I realize the power and the eloquence of the Bible and remember her emotions as our own.

Sweet Briar is a young college, comparatively speaking, in the world of women's education, but her campus, an old plantation, and Sweet Briar House are full of traditions that enrich the college.

Stories there were in my time of ghosts at Sweet Briar House—always friendly ones. I never saw them. But when I go back again I would like to see Miss Glass having coffee on the upper veranda.—Anna Lawrence Ferguson.

[From the Richmond Times Dispatch, Mar. 23, 1967]

DR. META GLASS

Dr. Meta Glass was one of the foremost educators of her time, and also one of the great personalities. Her achievements as president of Sweet Briar College for more than a score of years were notable, but the impact of her intellect and her charm upon the world around her was equally so.

At Sweet Briar she concentrated on the need for academic excellence, without carrying matters to unwarranted extremes. Under her guidance the college was raised to a scholastic level commensurate with that of other leading women's colleges in the nation.

An accomplished classicist, who taught Latin and Greek, she was an intellectual in the best sense, and hence eminently qualified to lead Sweet Briar by both precept and example. Her achievements in this respect were widely recognized in her election to the presidencies of national organizations in the sphere of education. She was also the recipient of honorary degrees from eight institutions.

But Miss Glass was more than an educator, important as her contributions were in that field. She was a lady of marked personal magnetism, with sparkling blue eyes and a truly exceptional sense of humor. She was often able to laugh at herself—one of the better tests of this quality.

Miss Glass also loved to dance. And during World War II—when, as at other times, she refused to take herself too seriously—she "jerked soda" in the college inn when there was a shortage of help.

As a result of these rare attributes of character, she won the admiration and devotion of the Sweet Briar students, despite the fact that she was constantly challenging them to greater and greater academic achievement.

Dr. Glass added new laurels to a greatly respected Virginia family, which included her half-brothers, the late U.S. Sen. Carter Glass and Dr. Edward Christian Glass, Lynchburg superintendent of schools for over half a century. Her going removes one of the foremost Virginians of her generation.

FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, few youth organizations have contributed more to the solid structure of our Nation than Future Homemakers of America, a national organization of some 600,000 young women who have in common the desire to become wise, responsible, inspiring members of family and community.

These active young women learn through school guidance and activities that a homemaker's world is not necessarily confined to the four walls of a

house. They recognize that a good homemaker is a good citizen, a community leader, and a steadying family influence.

Without doubt, these fine young ladies are developing the moral fiber and the wholesome attitude necessary to create a home environment conducive to the development of stable, productive individuals—the leaders of the future.

Future Homemakers of America, from April 2 to 9, celebrates 21 years of establishing a "foundation for progress," and 13,670 members from my home State of Pennsylvania join in this celebration. It is certain that FHA will continue to grow upon this solid foundation.

ADDRESS BY HON. EDWARD CLARK, AMBASSADOR TO AUSTRALIA, BEFORE JOINT SESSION OF TEXAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, several days ago the U.S. Ambassador to Australia, Hon. Edward Clark, addressed a joint session of the Texas Legislature.

Many Senators are personally acquainted with this able and distinguished gentleman, and I think they will find his words of considerable interest, especially his remarks on Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY EDWARD CLARK, AMERICAN AMBASSADOR TO AUSTRALIA, BEFORE A JOINT SESSION OF THE TEXAS LEGISLATURE, AUSTIN, TEX., MARCH 22, 1967

Governor Connally, Mr. President of the Senate, Mr. Speaker of the House, Members of the Legislature, Ladies and Gentlemen:

In the past eighteen months many exciting things have happened to me. I have literally walked with Kings and sat in the seats of power, but to a Texas boy can come no greater thrill than to be invited to stand on this podium and address the most august body in the world—the Joint Session of the Texas Legislature.

In 1923, I came here accompanied by my Grandfather Edward Dennis Downs, member of the 38th Legislature. Ten years later, I sat in the gallery as an Assistant Attorney General, member of the staff of Attorney General, Governor and Judge, James V. Allred—God Rest His Soul.

For the next six years as Assistant Attorney General, Assistant to the Governor, as Texas Secretary of State, I watched your proceedings and some times attempted to influence your actions in what, I thought, was the public interest. I have never been a member. From 1939 to 1965, I practiced law here in Austin. The actions of this body were part of my life, one of my main interests. I often sat in the galleries and listened to the great and near-great who were asked to address you. Never did I think I should deserve this honor, and I am humbled to think I am addressing the Body before whom appeared such patriots and statesmen as Houston, Hogg and Allred.

Perhaps I don't deserve it now but here I stand, happy, proud, still a Texan—who feels like that great and distinguished compatriot, Governor William P. Hobby, who once told me, "Had I the choice, I'd elect to be a life member of the Texas Senate—There I feel I could be the greatest influence for the good in the whole U.S.A."

Today I come to bring you a few thoughts I have collected since I left home a year and

a half ago. There is a saying "That he who travels never goes all the way home." I find that completely true.

Before I departed for Australia in 1965, President Johnson told me that he didn't want me to be United States Ambassador to Canberra. He wanted me to get out and "get with" the Australian people. That I have done.

In doing so, I have travelled 150,000 miles within Australia. I have visited every Australian State from the little island State of Tasmania in the extreme South to Queensland's tropical sugar cane and fruit growing country in the North. I have seen the beautiful harbour of Sydney, N.S.W. on the Western shores of the Pacific Ocean and Perth in Western Australia which looks out over the vast reaches of the Indian Ocean.

I have been to all of the State capitals and most of the major centers of population. I have visited Alice Springs, the picturesque city which dominates the great central desert area of the Northern Territory and which was made famous by the Australian author Nevil Shute in his book "A Town Called Alice." I have been to Kalgoorlie in Western Australia, the great gold and silver and copper mining center where President Herbert Hoover as a young mining engineer spent some of his years as a young man. I have been to Darwin and the great Northern Territory, to the Territory of Papua and New Guinea where many of our American soldiers and the Australian Diggers fought during World War II; and I have been to Norfolk Island, and Australian territory some 1300 miles off Australia's east coast.

Also, while I'm on the subject of travel, I have been to the Antarctic Continent and to the South Pole. I was interested in our scientific co-operation, not only with Australia on that vast continent, but also with our Russian, New Zealand, Argentinian, British, and French scientific colleagues.

I shall certainly never be the same person after the experiences that I've had. When I was in Perth and stood on the edge of the Indian Ocean, I was as far away from Washington, D.C. as an Ambassador of the United States can possibly be, and I found myself thinking can this be me, Ed Clark of San Augustine, standing here. It was like Rupert Brooke, poet of World War I, saying—"If I should die there'll be some corner of a foreign land that is Forever England"—If they ever have to bury me abroad—God forbid—there'll be a corner "Forever Texas." I have often been accused of being not the Ambassador of the United States, but the Ambassador of Texas. Like the man who threw the rock at the cat and hit his mother-in-law, I say "Not so bad after all."

When I speak of "never going all the way home" I must tell you—in case there are some youngsters who have come to the Legislature in the last two years—my home yesterday, today, and tomorrow is San Augustine. San Augustine in the 1st Judicial District, 7th Congressional District, 3rd Senatorial District, District 4 of this House, Cradle of Texas, where Houston, Henderson, Rusk, Sublett, Blount, Horton and Roberts hatched their hopes of Independence, licked their wounds, and literally founded the Republic of Texas. San Augustine between the towns of Nacogdoches, Texas, and Natchitoches, Louisiana—founded by the twin sons of the Indian Chief. At 16, I boarded the Gulf, Colorado and Santa Fe for Georgetown, Texas, and old Southwestern University. I'd never met a foreigner or had a drink of anything stronger than blackberry wine.

Forty years later when I disembarked from an airplane in Canberra, Australia, I had a brave face but a sinking heart. Three days later when I buckled on striped pants and top hat to present my credentials to the Governor General, no soldier facing an enemy bunker ever felt more frightened. The world was upside down. There were ani-

mals, trees and stars never seen in North America. It was cold, frosty 65° on August 15, cars were driving on the wrong side of the road and those brave Aussies were speaking in a brand of English that Ben Ramsey and I couldn't understand. I was startled when the dogwood flowered in October.

Time passed quickly. By the time Christmas came with the temperatures in the hundreds, daisies blooming in the garden, and the heretofore unknown Constellation, the Southern Cross, blazing in the skies I was almost an Aussie. Already my wife and I loved our new friends and our second home. The Australians always remind me of Texans—they are great people—our kind.

Now I feel qualified to talk to you a bit about the matter which is in every heart and every mind—namely Vietnam, that ill-starred little country—which was formerly French Indo China. In Australia, Vietnam and its problems are very close. Australia has troops, ships and airplanes there. Australia also has Aid missions there: medical, agricultural, technological. Australia's fighting contingent may be somewhat small compared to our own, but the diggers are top-notch fighting men, the equal man-for-man of any defense force in the world. They, and the government of Australia, have stood up and been counted.

Sure there is opposition, just as there is here in the United States. The opposers are in the minority, just as here, but minorities have rights under our form of government and we honor their right to oppose, even if, as in the present case, we don't always respect the ways in which they go about it.

Of course war is sinful. Of course people get hurt in war. Of course men lose their lives. Of course errors occur in intelligence and reconnaissance, and in aiming of shells and bombs, with resulting casualties among civilians. It is all terrible and frightening and deeply disturbing. It is all grim and ghastly. The atrocities committed by the Viet Cong on helpless civilians, their deliberate mass murdering of all South Vietnamese men who show qualities of leadership or who have skills in any field, their planting of booby traps and bombs in places of public gatherings, their intimidation of the peasantry are all loathsome forms of fratricide and terrorism. No less awful (but most certainly not deliberate) is the destruction of property and life by allied forces. God grant an early ending to it all!

But one cannot but long for some constructive alternative suggestions from those earnest, well-meaning critics—and from the Vietnams and the professional protesters as well—who constantly and bitterly denounce our government for the stand it has taken. Do they want us to condone tyranny? Do they expect their government to take this challenge to our very way of life lying down? How long could we honorably have avoided acknowledging that it existed? And, having been loyal to our commitments, how could we honorably abandon the fight and leave the South Vietnamese to the mercy of those tyrants who have vowed to take over all neighboring nations?

How could we honorably sign the death warrant of Laos, Thailand, Burma and India to which our refusal to be involved would have amounted? How could we possibly be so foolish as to have supposed that a hands-off policy on our part in Vietnam would have resulted in peace? What alternatives are there? Do we not have a right to some positive suggestions from those who so vocally oppose us and who sit in judgment—these self-appointed judges—upon the present policies of our government? Do we not owe much sympathy and compassion, as well as loyalty, to our beleaguered national leaders—leaders who are in their position of leadership because we put them there—who are forced to make these awesome decisions? Is it not right to use heads as well as hearts

in this terrible national dilemma? The public has a right to hear from academic and church and cultural leaders more than negative criticism and vilification.

"But," you say, "Why are we there? What business is it of ours?" It is a fair question. I have not visited the country either. But in Australia it is awfully close. There it is not the "Far East." It is the "Near North." Flying direct to Saigon from Sydney takes only a few hours.

A young Digger, hat turned up, talking straight, stood in my office in Canberra one day and said—"What am I doing fighting there? Well, it's a hell of a lot better than fighting in Queensland where my folks are." Queensland is in Northern Australia. Its capital is Brisbane where McArthur had his headquarters, where any stray American is received with open arms and sooner or later told—"But for you Americans, we'd be pulling a rickshaw today."

Even the lads of today who are fighting in Vietnam remember the terror of those days in the forties when Singapore fell, when bombs dropped on Darwin and submarines came into Sydney Harbor. Then it was that the Australian Prime Minister Chiefly said—"Australia's destiny lies not with Britain but with the United States."

Should we abandon them now in Vietnam, these eleven and a half million Australians would be at the mercy of the land hungry Chinese Communists. Then the island hopping of the forties would be repeated. Too many of this audience have known me too well and too long for me to try and qualify as an expert on foreign policy, but at long last, I've seen the elephant and heard the owl. I don't know how many of you served in the South Pacific in the forties but I will name a few—The President of the United States, the Governor of Texas, Sen. John Tower, my friends, Col. Ben Greig, Congressman Ray Roberts, George Page, Melvin Price of Georgetown, Len Dure and Sen. Ralph Yarborough served first in Europe and then in the Army of occupation in Japan.

They are all comrades forever with the Aussies. The issues are extremely complex, wars are never good, there are no easy ways. But once you've had an Asian friend who has fled the Communists and was hidden in an attic, as was my friend Ambassador Lee of Korea, or one who wept on your shoulder for his dead wife as did my friend, the gentle little Ambassador from Vietnam, or my friend beautiful Lillian Chen, American citizen and wife of the Chinese Ambassador, whose old Father was killed by the Red Guards last week, things take a different view.

In 1942 some wanted to draw a line across the Australian continent. They called it the Brisbane Line, and would have evacuated everything to the North. Then came MacArthur saying—"No, the whole country shall be defended." The Battle of the Coral Sea followed and was the turning point of the war. Twenty-five years later, on the anniversary of that battle, bands play, soldiers march, fireworks flare and people dance till dawn to celebrate their escape. Our friendship was not lightly given in those days nor shall it be easily withdrawn.

Australia—which Prime Minister Billy Hughes in 1918 called "a pleasant land in the backwater of the world where it is always afternoon and nearly always tea time"—has come of age. Beside the mobs of cattle and sheep, which have the finest, silkiest merino wool in the world, the sound of the drilling rig is now heard, and the hammer of the mining machines. Hydro electric complexes are humming. It is the jewel of the Pacific, a plum ripe for the picking. Any power-hungry country would like to possess it. Britannia no longer rules the waves, so we must protect our stake in the Pacific where Australia is eager to help us. In that connection, it would startle you if I could recite

the extent to which our defense mechanisms are based on this stationary aircraft carrier.

Those who so bitterly assail President Johnson's handling of the Vietnamese situation are mostly abysmally ignorant of the background of the commitments he inherited. At the time of our involvement in Vietnam, Moscow and Peking were working together. Indonesia was in the Chinese orbit, war was on the horizon in Malaysia. To enter Indo China was dangerous, to stand aside meant risking the world power balance at incalculable peril. Today the Soviet Union is at odds with China. Indonesia is back in the United Nations, the Malaysian crisis is liquidated. Also, President Johnson's decisive Dominican action seems to have reduced to minor scale Communist intrigue in the Caribbean. A new and favorable balance is emerging, and the Vietnam problem seems to be moving toward manageable dimensions, offering a possibility of peace and disengagement without tossing Asia overboard.

In 1964, Republicans bolted from Goldwater to Johnson by millions. In 1966, they simply returned to the fold, perhaps restoring the hairline balance by which Kennedy defeated Nixon. Many dissident Democrats now wish to attack an embattled President. Mr. Adolf Berle, lawyer, professor, author, advisor and confidant of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, recently said in an "Appraisal of LBJ by an Old New Dealer," and I quote, "He is not a great politician; he is not a romantic image. The brilliant court and flashing pennons of Camelot are not his. But neither is he an Andrew Johnson, vulnerable to attack by misguided idealists." And this is my own personal appraisal—this is Ed Clark speaking—neither is he swayed from his humanitarian purpose by the placards and shrill cries of the long-haired, bearded "beatniks" and "peaceniks" who protest for the sake of protest and offer no alternative. He is a tactician, dealing in realities rather than in unassailable abstractions and is not playing any politics in this war.

Now you don't need me to tell you that the world is getting smaller every day. In my boyhood and young manhood, Asia was a far-off place we read about and dreamed about but never really expected to see. Now it's a short hop in a jet airliner. And, living in Australia, whose western shore was washed by the Indian Ocean, I have developed an appreciation, an understanding for the vastness, the importance, and the potential of that part of the world and for the aspirations of its peoples.

Their aspirations and hopes and dreams differ little from ours. They want to be able to live in peace. They want to raise their living standards. They want their children to get a good education and to be assured of a brighter future than their parents have had. They want to be able to see a doctor when they need one. They want freedom and justice and a voice in the world's councils.

Asia's resources are great. But they need our help in developing them. They need our co-operation in order to defend themselves from aggression. They need a neighbor, a good neighbor, who will help them bring order and progress and a better life and a lasting peace to this area of the world where half of the human race lives.

President Johnson in an address recently said, "Asia is now the crucial arena of man's striving for independence and order—and for life itself.—If enduring peace can come to Asia, all mankind will benefit. But if peace fails there, nowhere else will our achievements be secure. By peace in Asia I do not mean simply the absence of armed hostilities. For where men hunger and hate, there can be no peace. I do not mean the peace of conquest. For humiliation can be the seedbed of war. And I do not mean

simply the peace of the conference table. For peace is not written merely in the words of treaties, but in the day by day works of builders. The peace we seek in Asia is a peace of conciliation: between Communist States and their non-communist neighbors; between rich nations and poor; between small nations and large; between men whose skins are brown and black and yellow and white."

Further along in that address the President stated that the United States was determined to meet its obligations in Asia as a Pacific power. He promised that the United States would do its part to meet its obligations toward freedom and security in Asia; that we would not be party to a world which left Asia sitting outside the door of the twentieth century. Unfortunately, on many of these projects and in many of his policies, the President has had to depend upon his own dogged determination, using the tools he has, denied the help of some who should have been with him. This rugged Texan—who didn't go to Harvard—has plotted the contours and trace lines of a domestic and foreign policy that is America's future.

Be the outcome triumph or tragedy don't underestimate your President. Until those dogooders, those armchair strategists, those hotel room generals can offer you a better plan, a safer haven for your wives and children, a stronger vault for your money and bonds—the Prime Minister of Australia and Ed Clark will still be all the way with LBJ.

NEFARIOUS ACTIVITIES OF U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the U.S. Office of Education, in its dictatorial operations and double standards which exceed the authority given it under the Civil Rights Act, goes about its nefarious business despite widespread concern here in the Congress.

Its agents moving about the South remind me of a plague of locusts, wreaking such havoc it may require decades of hard work and sweat to recover. They are descending on local authorities like knights commissioned by some high and mighty force, and they issue their orders to local school leaders and boards much like the reading or posting of a proclamation in the days before a democratic government with checks and balances was even envisioned.

They are applying one standard in the South, and quite another in the North, East, and West. The sooner they go into these other areas of the country and spread their venom the quicker the Congress will demand steps be taken to correct these obvious inequities. The question that concerns me is whether or not the school system of the South will be reduced to a shambles by that date, or whether it will still retain some of the viable and intrinsic values which it possessed at the beginning of this decade.

Today, signs abound which indicate to me that the great American dream and the promise of the fruits of our free enterprise system are eroding rapidly, and this Nation is in a descent similar to the first stages which have wiped from the face of the earth other great civilizations and nations.

At the base of the many problems which beset us is the devastating attack being made on our duly elected and appointed authorities at the local levels. In the past years we have seen our Federal Government change from the ser-

vant of our people to the master of our people. This change is evidenced in the monolithic and capricious dictates of the Office of Education and other Federal agencies. I urge Congress not to let this year pass without coming to grips with these bureaucrats who are moving about the South like locusts and devouring our educational system without the force of law and without regard to the human elements which make man a creature of God.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two items on the school system which I feel will be of interest to Senators. The first is an editorial entitled "A Feeble Defense," published in the March 20, 1967, issue of the Augusta, Ga., Chronicle. The second is an article entitled "County Order To Close Negro Schools," published in the March 2, 1967, issue of the Pickens, S.C., Sentinel.

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

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, Mar. 20, 1967]

A FEEBLE DEFENSE

Ignoring the fact that the Civil Rights Act simply forbids discrimination in pupil assignments and specifically forbids interpretation so as to require any specific degree of school integration, the federal Office of Education applies to the South alone its illegal guidelines and coerces Southern schools with the iniquitous power of fund cutoffs.

This punitive application on a sectional basis has long been the target of criticism by concerned Southern school administrators, but up to now the answer generally has been silence. This silence is broken, at last, by David S. Seeley, assistant commissioner of education, in an article in the current issue of the NEA Journal.

Seeley claims the reason the federal government shuts its eyes to complete or virtually complete school segregation in Northern and Western cities is that segregation outside the South is the result only of housing patterns. The South has the boom lowered on it because, so he says, segregation here is the result of official action.

His ignorance of housing patterns in the South is astounding. So far as official policies are concerned, the Civil Rights Act which forbids discrimination in any individual case now governs in the South just as in the North. The continuing degree of segregation is the result of housing patterns and free choice, save for isolated instances.

If the Office of Education were willing, in good faith, to let housing patterns govern, as they do in the North, it would cancel its guidelines which in effect call for moving masses of children from one area to another.

The guidelines are strictly punitive, and the Office of Education knows it, and intends it to be that way.

[From the Pickens (S.C.) Sentinel, Mar. 2, 1967]

BUSSEING ORDERED HALTED—COUNTY ORDERED TO CLOSE NEGRO SCHOOLS

Pickens County school authorities have been ordered to "remove all semblance of Negro schools in this county within the next four years."

Supt. Joe C. Durham told the board of trustees Monday night that an official from the Health, Education and Welfare Office in Washington visited in his office recently and laid down guidelines which the local schools must follow.

He said local officials were told to close down two Negro elementary schools next year and all Negro schools within four years.

Calhoun-Clemson was ordered to close as soon as possible but no time limit was placed on this particular school since crowded conditions are expected there due to the recent Old Stone Church annexation.

The representative instructed that transportation of high school age Negroes from Pickens and Liberty to Easley must stop. Busing of Clemson Negroes would be allowed for some time due to the anticipated crowding conditions there.

County school faculties were also ordered integrated immediately with at least two teachers in each high school to be swapped this semester and also some in the elementary schools. Twenty faculty members were ordered integrated next year.

Supt. Durham said he told the representative that "this would upset the children."

He said that failure to comply will mean that local officials will be called to Washington for a hearing with the threat to cut off all federal funds to local schools if the examiner so rules.

The board glumly listened to the report and tersely moved that the "report be received as information and proceed with regular business."

RETENTION IN SERVICE OF NS "SAVANNAH"—RESOLUTION BY MONSIGNOR KIRWIN COUNCIL, KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS, GALVESTON, TEX.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a resolution adopted by the Monsignor Kirwin Council No. 787, Knights of Columbus, Galveston, Tex.

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

RESOLUTION

Whereas: The decision has been made by the Federal Government to lay up the nuclear-powered cargo liner Savannah and,

Whereas: This swift 23-Knot Vessel is needed when the Vietnam seallift is being maintained by slower outdated ships from the moth ball fleet and,

Whereas: The United States has enjoyed an improved image as a result of the tremendous impact of this vessel's around the world and,

Whereas: We the members of Monsignor Kirwin Council #787, feel that the dividend the Savannah has delivered to our Country in terms of prestige, good will and scientific advancement, far outweigh the cost of its operation.

Therefore: Be it resolved that we the officers and members of Monsignor Kirwin Council #787, of Galveston, Texas, urge your full support in our efforts to retain the N.S. Savannah in service and call upon the Congress of the United States to act immediately in our behalf.

Be it further resolved that this Resolution be sent to the Honorable Ralph W. Yarborough and the Honorable John G. Tower, U.S. Senators from the State of Texas and the Honorable Jack Brooks, Congressman from the Second District of the State of Texas.

IMPACT OF TELEVISION ON SOCIETY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Mr. Fred W. Friendly has written a penetrating and wise book which merits the attention of everyone concerned with the impact of television on our society.

The hearings early last year of the Committee on Foreign Relations had something to do with the writing of the

book, which tends to prove that efforts by the committee to bring about greater enlightenment on foreign policy issues may be more useful in preserving our democratic system than many suppose.

I ask unanimous consent that a review by Prof. Eric F. Goldman, of Mr. Friendly's book entitled "Due to Circumstances Beyond Our Control" be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE TRAGEDY OF AMERICAN TELEVISION (By Eric F. Goldman)

"Due to Circumstances Beyond Our Control." By Fred W. Friendly. Random House. 352 pp. \$6.95.

American television is too young to have developed a genuine literature. We have writings galore about it but few of the richer variety, the memoirs and biographies of the people who actually built TV and the deeper-cutting analytical discussions. As a real literature develops, surely an important place will go to this book by the longtime CBS producer and executive, Fred W. Friendly. It is a loosely constructed volume, compounded of history, memoir, polemic, and pleading. However constructed, it is a forceful book, enormously informed, tartly analytical, astute, passionate, and disturbing. No one can read it without a sharply heightened sense of the tragedy of American TV.

Friendly is much too good a TV man not to keep the basic structure of his book a continuous and decidedly human story. It starts in the late 1940s, when the formidable team of Edward R. Murrow and Friendly began to function. Dramatic chapters go behind the scenes of the famous telecasts which did so much to remove the odium of "security risk" from Lieutenant Milo Radulovich and the odium of Senator Joseph McCarthy from the United States. Then, in its hard-driving way, the book moves through other triumphs of *See It Now* and the "strange death" of the program, the unsteady days of *Small World*, the development of the split between CBS and its great ornament, Murrow, the thunder and the tribulations of *CBS Reports*, the embattled years of Friendly as head of CBS's powerful news operation, and the final clash which led to the uproar of his resignation and his present association with Columbia University and the Ford Foundation.

Friendly keeps his pages moving with a rapid fire of anecdotes, revealing, moving or amusing. There are the incidents of ex-President Eisenhower and President Kennedy both turning down a proposal to appear on TV, the one because he feared the joint appearance would make him appear too old, the other because it could make him seem too young; the stormy executive clash at CBS, with Executive Producer Fred Friendly turning on Chairman of the Board William S. Paley and stomping out the door which led not to the hall but to the private laboratory ("It took me five years to be able to laugh about that—and it was just about that long before I was in his office again"); the scene in the studio as Murrow finished his program on Lieutenant Radulovich, Murrow bathed in sweat and smoke in the air-conditioned room, the technicians, some with tears in their eyes, gathered around him to shake his hand; and the times when Friendly, without adequate sponsorship for an hour of Danny Kaye's UNICEF world trip, went out and hawked the program himself and Murrow, faced with the same situation for Marian Anderson, muttered as he reached for the phone, "If Friendly can sell Danny Kaye, I can sell the Lady from Philadelphia."

But the story aspects of the book, however readable, are anything but its central purpose. Fred Friendly is an outraged man. He is a TV enthusiast and, nostalgically, a

CBS enthusiast. He believes that the medium and the network did great things in the news and documentary fields and that both have enormous possibilities for the future. He also believes that—for some time and especially today—both have been shirking their potentialities, not to speak of their legal duty, in order to make bigger and bigger profits.

Many people in the TV industry have awaited this book, with glee or indignation, as an insider's assault on the titans of CBS. It does indict and it does present Paley, Frank Stanton, the president of CBS, and others in a way that will hardly delight them. No doubt they will disagree with some of his statements of fact and many of his interpretations, as they have already done publicly in certain instances. But the essence of the book is that it is not really a discussion of personalities at all. It is a criticism of American TV as an institution.

Although Friendly disavows any intention to write an "exposé," inevitably the book takes on something of that nature and the reader is reminded of the muckraking of Lincoln Steffens. The more Steffens looked at the condition of American cities in the early 20th century, the more he became convinced that the critical trouble came not from evil men but from a system which made good men do evil things and encouraged evil men to be themselves. The more Friendly's volume goes on, the more he hammers at "the system that keeps such unremitting pressure on men like Paley and Stanton."

In writing of this type, of course, the author appears basically right and his opponents basically wrong. But Friendly's emphasis on The System is such that his account is not simply the goodies vs. the baddies. Of himself, he says: "Possibly if I were in their jobs [the jobs of Paley and Stanton] I would have behaved as they did." He includes other comments about Fred Friendly that will surprise people who have not thought of humility and self-criticism as among his more marked characteristics. He speaks of his own moments of "arrogance," "lack of will power," and "tailorings" of conscience, and he includes a delicious quotation. "Friendly," a colleague remarked, "you'll never have a nervous breakdown, but you sure are a carrier." He has good words for Messrs. Paley and Stanton. They are "honorable men," of intelligence, taste, and a sense of public responsibility—and more and more caught in The System.

Friendly's description of The System, in many fundamentals, follows familiar lines. Quickly TV became big business with shareholders demanding that the profits be higher year after year. Advertisers bought time according to the Nielsen ratings, and the highest ratings customarily went to least-common-denominator programs of mediocre quality. Management either went after these profits—cutting down on the time given to unprofitable quality shows—or the stockholders would see to it that it ceased to be the management. In Friendly's analysis, the Paleys and the Stantons, whatever their imposing titles, lost control over the programming, which went to the TV merchandisers beneath them on the organization chart.

But if the broad outline of his analysis is familiar, the outline is filled in with so many nuances and such an abundance of fresh detail that it takes on the quality of the new. In particular, Friendly adds dimension to the discussion of the deeper effects of the quiz programs on the inner workings of TV; the meaning of the rigmarole of presidents and vice-presidents; and the enormous power in a network of its allegedly subordinate local stations.

In Friendly's book, The System rolls on so inexorably that it raises a question. I do not know whether he intends to say this but his System seems so ironclad that it leaves little or no room for improvement in commercial TV. Is this actually realistic, if a

number of TV leaders have the intelligence, character, and taste he describes and are operating under pressure from mounting criticism? Moreover, Friendly makes the market the dynamo of The System. He does not mention the polls which indicate that the better educated and upper-income, a market indeed, are increasingly turning off their TV sets, providing a highly practical incentive to get those sets on again by offering more of the types of programs which Friendly seeks. After all, Lincoln Steffens' deeply entrenched System of municipal government was not impervious to change, by pressures from within and without.

Be that as it may, he concludes his book with a quick but shrewd appraisal of the many plans which have been suggested to break or to supplement The System from the outside. Naturally enough, Friendly gives most emphasis to the idea which he originated and then worked out with McGeorge Bundy, president of the Ford Foundation—the proposal for a constellation of satellites serving the long-line needs of all broadcasters and operated by a non-profit corporation which would use its profits to finance a non-commercial network. Here Friendly's knowledgeable prediction should be noted: "Some satellite system benefiting noncommercial television is going to emerge in the coming months."

More than his knowledgeability, the end of the book expresses his passion about TV. The accidents of the medium brought Fred Friendly into association with that remarkable American, Edward R. Murrow. He was so influenced because the two men, in their very different ways, had the same fire in their bellies—a fire made up of all kinds of elements but including that age-old American emotion which insists that when something new comes along, it should be used to help the ordinary American become less ordinary.

Friendly left his influential post as president of CBS News in a turmoil of doubt. A particular juncture of events triggered his conclusion that he had to get out from The System "while I still could." Yet obviously he had enjoyed his powerful position tremendously—enjoyed the power as power and enjoyed using it for the public service purposes to which, whatever the problems, it could be put. But now with his resignation, as he writes somewhat melodramatically, he was no longer a man at "the big switch." He consoles himself: "If I can't tend the big switch, perhaps I can carry a spear or write a pamphlet or stoke a fire."

Fred Friendly should rest happy with his consolation. He has written not a pamphlet but a major book. He has stoked the fire of criticism of TV in a way which in the long run, I suspect, will serve the people of the United States as effectively as the memorable TV hours which he did so much to create.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY TEXAS ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several resolutions recently adopted by various groups in my State.

The first was passed by the Texas Daily Newspaper Association in support of S. 1312, a bill introduced by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], which would exempt from antitrust laws the so-called agency or a jointly owned publishing company for competing newspapers. I have the pleasure of being a cosponsor of S. 1312.

The second resolution was approved by the city council of Nederland, Tex., and concerns the pending deactivation of the 446th Troop Carrier Wing, and the 924th and 925th Troop Carrier Groups at Ellington Air Force Base.

The third resolution was submitted by the Second District, Veterans of World War I.

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

Whereas sharply rising payroll and newsprint costs have coincided with increased competition with other media for the reader's attention and the advertiser's dollar, and

Whereas it is in the public interest to maintain as great a variety of editorial viewpoints as is economically feasible, and

Whereas one of the most effective means of preserving a variety of editorial expression has been the joint publishing arrangements entered into by competing publishers in a score of cities over the country,

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Texas Daily Newspaper Association that this association urges passage of Senate Bill 1312, introduced by Senator Hayden of Arizona and cosponsored by Senator Tower of Texas declaring such joint arrangements to be in accord with public policy as set forth by the Congress of the United States.

(Unanimously adopted May 21, 1967, in Brownsville, Texas)

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the City of Nederland, Jefferson County, Texas, has met this day; and

Whereas, it has been brought to the attention of this Council that the 446th Troop Carrier Wing, the 924th and 925th Troop Carrier Groups at Ellington Air Force Base, Texas, are to be deactivated by the Department of the Air Force in October, 1967; and

Whereas, the outstanding Wing and Groups have been nationally recognized by the Department of Defense, Continental Air Command, Reserve Officers Association, the Air Force Association, and the Fourth Air Force Reserve Region; and

Whereas, this 446th Troop Carrier Wing has maintained a C-1 Rating, Combat Ready One Rating, longer than any other Reserve Wing; and

Whereas, the Texas Gulf Coast area is an excellent area for reserve manning capabilities; and

Whereas, the axiom "there is never enough airlift in an emergency" is true again; therefore,

Be it resolved by the city of Nederland, Jefferson County, Texas, that we the members of the City Council urge the Secretary of Defense and Congress to reconsider and to rescind the order deactivating the 446th Troop Carrier Wing Headquarters and its 924th and 925th Troop Carrier Groups.

Passed and approved by the unanimous vote of the City Council in Regular Meeting on this 14th day of March, Nineteen-Hundred and Sixty-Seven, A.D.

RESOLUTION

Whereas: Now under the Old and New Pension Law, now in force, covering the Spanish America, World War One, World War Two and Korean Veterans in the Annual Income Report Card, that is required to be submitted by the veteran, or widow, the Veterans Administration charges Social Security, Railroad Retirement and Civil Service Retirements pay as income against the veteran or his widow VA Pension;

Now therefore: Be it resolved that the delegates to and at the Veterans Of World War One of Texas of the Second District, duly assembled in District Meeting at Vidor, Texas, on this 25th day of March, 1967 petition, go on record and urgently request that the Congress of the United States amend said Veterans Pension Acts so that no increases in Social Security, Railroad Retirement, and Civil Service Retirement Payments, City, State or National that have been made since December 1, 1964 or hereafter shall be chargeable as income for veterans Pension Payments by the Veterans Administration and:

Be it further resolved: That a copy of this resolution be mailed, by the District Adjutant, of the Second District, as soon as this meeting Adjourns, to the Honorable Senator Ralph Yarborough, Honorable Senator John Tower, Honorable Congressman John Dowdy and Honorable Congressman Jack Brooks. The Resolution to be sent by Air Mail.

The above resolution was duly passed at the Second District Meeting on the 25th day of March, 1967.

ADDRESS BY PERRIN JONES ON 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF SIGNING OF SMITH-HUGHES ACT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have been furnished a copy of a thoughtful and persuasive speech concerning the value of vocational education which was delivered by my good friend, Mr. Perrin Jones, on the 50th anniversary of the signing of the Smith-Hughes Act. Mr. Jones is a member of the Arkansas Board for Vocational Education and is secretary of the National Association of State Boards of Education.

Mr. President, I urge every Member of the Senate to give careful attention to Mr. Jones' address, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

SEARCY, ARK., VOCATIONAL BANQUET, FEBRUARY 23, 1967

(By Perrin Jones, speaker)

"No man is an island entire of itself. Each man is a piece of the continent . . . a part of the main. If a clod of earth be washed away, Europe is the less. If any man die it diminishes me because I am involved in mankind. Therefore never send to ask for whom the bell tolls . . . it tolls for thee. . . ."

JOHN DONNE.

We are gathered here tonight to commemorate something that is important. It is important to you and it is important to me. And it came about because men and women, like you and me, believed in John Donne's statement of our mutual concern for one another.

I've always thought it both interesting and fitting that the first move into the field of vocational training was signed into law by the most highly educated man ever to sit in the Presidential chair. Interesting because . . . after the centuries of battle between the forces of academic education and those who would offer practical training in trades . . . such a man with such a background could normally have been expected to push for academic higher education to the exclusion of vocational training. Fitting because it was in the nature of Woodrow Wilson to want to better the lot of his fellow man through any means available . . . a belief that was a direct result of his academic training and his deep understanding of the American economic system.

The Smith-Hughes Act was signed into law in February, 1917. It provided for limited aid to insure vocational training in the public schools of the land. Arkansas moved immediately into the field . . . within 11 days . . . and we had the minute beginnings of the vocational agriculture and home economics training that have become fixtures in the public school curriculum of this state. In a small and relatively poor state, our people were among the first to realize the advantages of vocational education. This is marked by many activities . . . the fact that the second FFA charter in the nation was issued to Arkansas . . . the quick follow-up of each expansion of the act over the years into diversified occupations and distributive

education . . . the bold step out ahead of Arkansas in setting up state-financed vocational technical schools before the federal act inserted national money into the project . . . and the rapid expansion of this program to 10 schools within two years of the additional aid . . . the present plans for a high-level vocational technical institute. All of these things point to our state interest in and reliance on vocational training.

We've come a long way in 50 years but we've still got a long way to go.

I wonder if very many of you here tonight realize that you . . . even fifty years after the start of this project in this country . . . are really pioneers. Oh, the program has been sold to our people now but I wonder if you realize just how short a time fifty years actually is in the long history of the fight for public education.

For that reason, I'd like to go back a few centuries and point out to you that in feudal Europe, education was a luxury intended only for the privileged, ruling classes. The people . . . those who weren't born to wealth and power . . . were intentionally deprived of education as a means of keeping them in servitude.

The right to education had its genesis almost by accident. Rulers and landowners began to see that productivity could be increased by education. They went into it on a limited . . . and selective basis . . . as an investment in getting more work out of slaves. It had a different result . . . education brought with it the by-product of freedom. And freedom fed on education and education fed on freedom until they became inseparable.

That's why one of the first things guaranteed in the new revolutionary societies . . . in the United States . . . in France . . . was free public education. As the masses became better educated, they insisted on guaranteeing ever better educational opportunities to their children. Free societies began to tax for the sole purpose of educating their people. But virtually all of this education advancement was confined to academic standards. The idea was that, if you gave a man or woman a good liberal education they could develop their own trades and skills.

When the idea first emerged that, while an academic education was desirable and, indeed, necessary, it was not the vital factor that made a man good at his trade . . . at earning a good living . . . the battle was joined. Tax monies were involved. Academicians claimed that to dilute public education funds to teach trades would wash away the financial base upon which modern free education stood. This battle was long and bitter. And there are still those today . . . a very few . . . who hold to that belief.

The vast majority of our people have begun to see our devotion to vocational training as an investment . . . an investment that will pay dividends far into the future . . . dividends that will finance better both academic and vocational education.

If you give a man the ability to read and write . . . and not the training to use his hands you may be creating an educated but unproductive individual. You must give him the opportunity for both and the well trained person will, by virtue of his training and ability, earn more . . . pay more taxes . . . and, eventually, better finance the whole program of public education.

Now, how does all this affect you? How are you Pioneers? Why is any of this of personal value?

It, for the first time makes it an accepted fact that a college education is not necessarily on a higher level than specialized vocational training. We've all lived in a college oriented society . . . leaving those who were trained in vocational skills under some sort of mysterious stigma presumably associated with a lack of wealth or a lack of brains or some other such foolishness. The last 50

years of the results of vocational training in this country has taken the stigma away. It has proven for all time that there are those individuals whose abilities and talents make vocational training more profitable for them than a college course.

Examples, oft repeated . . . and I can give you several, have shown the value of real, concrete working knowledge over highly developed academic training.

To illustrate this point, I'd like to tell you a story told me a few years ago on a visit to the Martin Company's plant in Littleton, Colorado.

The Titan missile system was engineered to perfection . . . including a guidance system that worked beautifully in tests but went haywire on every actual launch. The experts were baffled and worked on the problem endlessly for quite some time. Finally, two of the engineers who were beating their brains out to solve the problem were discussing it in the plant's men's room one day and were overheard by a plumber working there.

He said, "Have you ever tried baffles?"

Just like that the problem was solved. There was nothing wrong with the guidance system but the liquid fuel in the rocket was sloshing around, throwing the whole thing off course. The practical knowledge of his vocational field held by a plumber solved this problem that graduate engineers could not . . . because they weren't trained in the same way. One was not better trained than the other . . . but they were trained differently.

This isn't intended as a slap at college, but a realization that vocational training is on a par with it, depending on the individual being educated.

And the final tie . . . to show you what all this means to you . . . lies in the courses you are following. You live in the wealthiest nation on earth . . . a nation with a surplus of food while much of the world starves . . . a nation filled with people who can have a balanced diet and live in clean and properly run homes while most of the world cannot . . . a nation in which tradesmen can rise to any level based upon their knowledge and ability . . . and a nation where a factory worker can enjoy as high a standard of living as a bank president.

You are a part of the process that has made this so and you are representative of whether it will remain so in the future. It is important that you learn the lessons of FFA, FHA, DECA and all the other associated organizations that promote this process. It is important to your ability to earn a good living or be a good housewife or whatever you choose to do.

Woodrow Wilson really started something . . . something that makes him live fifty years after his time and will make him live for generations to come . . . because he cared for other men and women . . . because he saw an America in which every man and woman could reach their highest level of achievement, academically or vocationally . . .

What you do with your training . . . how well you do your learning now . . . will essentially determine the kind of America you will live in.

"No man is an island . . ."

THIRD-CLASS MAIL

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in recent months newspapers and other groups have mounted an all-out attack on the users of third-class mail.

As a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I have had many opportunities to examine the various sides of this controversy. I have seen certain problems created by third-class mail, but I have also seen many benefits of third-class mail.

To begin with, I believe that all mail—

and all classes of mail—is good so long as the material is honest, moral, and in good taste. The Nation's mail is an important indicator of our economy, and every class of mail makes a significant contribution to the country's economic health.

Third-class mail is no exception. It is one of the most important and most useful forms of advertising. For many businessmen, it is the only effective form of advertising.

I suspect that this is precisely the problem. A few housewives have received some material which they did not want, but the major outcry sounds suspiciously like it is being raised by other forms of advertising, which resent the success of third-class mail.

The name "junk mail," which is frequently applied to this kind of mail, is a misnomer. As some Senators know, the Postmaster General of 12 years ago issued an order that unaddressed circulars could be delivered in bundles to letter carriers and then distributed along the routes like handbills. This plan proved bulky and unworkable and was soon abandoned. But the idea that such advertising circulars were throwaways, like handbills, has unfortunately lingered on.

Certainly such mail advertising is not "junk." It represents, I am told, some 20 percent of the advertising expenditures of many merchants. These men are intelligent businessmen. They would not be throwing away their money on useless forms of advertising. I therefore conclude that third-class mail must be an effective means of getting across their message.

In fact, for some merchants—small businesses who cannot afford huge advertising expenses for radio and television—third-class mail is the most economical and most effective means of blanketing their immediate area.

In sum, according to the Department of Commerce, \$40 billion in goods and services are sold each year through third-class mail. More than 300,000 American businesses, large and small, depend on this medium for their success and survival.

The question, then, comes down to the rates which are paid by third-class mail. Postmaster General O'Brien, himself, has on several occasions defended third-class mail as a class benefiting both the national economy and the individual user, but he would like to see the rates increased on this class and all other classes of mail.

Certainly we will want to hear Mr. O'Brien's proposals in depth. What we want to make certain is that we treat all classes of mail fairly. A discriminatory increase in third-class rates, making the cost of using this class prohibitive, would be a very unwise step.

Why do I say this? Because the Post Office Department would practically collapse without third-class mail. This class provides 28 percent of the total annual volume. It provides \$700 million a year in revenues.

It has been estimated, in fact, that if the third-class mail were eliminated entirely, the Post Office would have to charge at least 15 cents for a first-class stamp, just to keep in the same financial condition that it presently occupies.

This is true for a variety of reasons. Third-class mailers get reduced rates, and they are required to Zip code every piece of mail and to sort, tie, and otherwise process the mail. If there were no such class of mail, and if it were sent first class—or not at all—the costs of processing first-class mail would skyrocket.

But my purpose today is not to argue the question of postage charges. Just today Postmaster General O'Brien has proposed turning over the mail service to a nonprofit Government corporation, which would necessitate a rethinking of the entire postal charge system.

What I want to stress is that third-class mail is being unfairly slandered. It is not "junk mail." It is a useful and important segment of the American economy. We should not suddenly propose sharp increases in third-class mail rates without realizing the drastic economic and postal problems that would follow such a move.

Let us treat third-class mail users fairly and recognize their contribution to the American economy.

THE 25 MILLIONTH VOTE IN NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD ELECTIONS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the National Labor Relations Board has just concluded an official celebration of the 25 millionth vote cast in secret elections conducted by the Board. Labor and management joined in sponsoring both the ceremonies here and those held in the various regions throughout the country.

It was a particular pleasure for me to participate in the celebration here in Washington and in Newark, because it was in New Jersey that the 25 millionth vote was cast by Leonard Paul Scheno, a machinist and mechanic of Carteret, N.J., who is employed at the new Reynolds Metal Co. plant in Woodbridge. Mr. Scheno and the other workers selected the United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO, as their bargaining agent with the plant. The ceremonies occasioned widespread comment in the press.

I ask unanimous consent that a group of representative editorials be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Mar. 2, 1967]

LABOR DEMOCRACY MILESTONE

Leaders of labor and management will join with Congressional Democrats and Republicans in Washington today to mark the casting of the 25-millionth secret ballot in elections conducted by the National Labor Relations Board.

Before the election machinery was established under the old Wagner Act three decades ago, disputes over union recognition were the greatest single source of strikes and industrial turmoil. Even after the law's passage, the sit-down strikes in autos and other mass production industries testified to the difficulties of substituting democratic procedures for the exercise of muscle.

Now, particularly in Southern textile, there remain some outposts of resistance to the use of such civilized methods for establishing whether the workers desire to be represented by a specific union. But in the great bulk of American industry that question is

resolved by peaceful exercise of the ballot, without strikes or coercion.

Two other major generators of strikes also have yielded to the exercise of reason in recent years. Grievances arising out of the interpretation of labor-management agreements are now almost universally settled through arbitration. Jurisdictional disputes are disposed of, in the main, by special peacemaking tribunals set up by organized labor itself or by recourse to the Labor Board.

The progress that has been made toward abolishing industrial warfare in all these fields provides at least a foundation for hope that it will not take another three decades to make comparable breakthroughs in reducing strife over the negotiation of new labor-management agreements, the last remaining industrial battlefield.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Feb. 28, 1967]

INDUSTRIAL BALLOT BOX

Sam Zagoria of the National Labor Relations Board reminded an audience the other day that the Board has conducted 200,000 secret-ballot elections since 1935. Attainment of this milestone is being celebrated in Washington this week with special honors for the New Jersey steelworker who became the 25 millionth voter in such an election. The occasion is a happy reminder of how routine this type of industrial balloting has become.

Only two decades ago bombings and violence were commonplace in union organizing campaigns. Mr. Zagoria reminds us that 2,728 strikes were called for organizing purposes in 1937. By 1964 strikes of this kind had declined to 35. Today it is standard practice to settle the question of worker representation for collective bargaining purposes through an NLRB election. Judging from its record, the Board will hold about 8,000 elections this year, with an average of 90 per cent of the eligible workers participating.

This is no meager accomplishment. The unsolved problems in the labor-management field are still enormous, but collective bargaining has become the established norm, and any group which has a majority in an industrial plant may obtain bargaining rights through peaceful and logical resort to the ballot box.

Four out of five of the NLRB elections these days are conducted by agreement of the company and the union. The willingness to accept orderly democratic procedures in place of repression on one side and violence on the other is a tribute to both. We hope that the next two decades will bring as much progress in other areas of conflict as the last two have brought in the acceptance of free industrial elections.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Mar. 5, 1957]

TWENTY-FIVE MILLION NLRB VOTES LATER: BREAKING BREAD, NOT HEADS (By Wilfrid C. Rodgers)

Replace bloodshed and turmoil with a ballot box?

"It will never work," cried most industrialists and even a handful of anarchist-minded labor leaders.

That was more than 31 years ago. This past week in testimony of how successful the Wagner Labor Relations Act and the National Labor Relations Board have become, labor and management sat down together in Washington and broke bread.

Not that success came easy. It never does. Yet recently Leonard Paul Scheno, a machinist and mechanic of Carteret, N.J., voted in an NLRB-supervised election at the new Reynolds Metal Co. plant in Woodbridge, N.J.

Workers at the plant selected the United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO, as their exclusive bargaining agent with the firm. Scheno was the 25 millionth voter in an NLRB election.

Aim of the Wagner Act was partly economic—to enable industrial workers to raise their wages and improve their standard of living—and also to attempt to minimize labor disputes.

Historically, before passage of the Wagner Act, the bloodiest and most violent strikes occurred when workers attempted to gain recognition of their unions as bargaining agents. Labor histories list some of these as the Haymarket Riot in Chicago, the Homestead, Pa., steel dispute; the Pullman strike, the McNamara dynamiting in Los Angeles and the auto industry sit-down strikes.

In 1935, the year Congress set up secret-ballot elections for workers, about half of the nation's labor disputes had as their major issue union recognition and the workers' rights to organize.

Today less than 0.03 of the man days lost by strikes resulted from walkouts to obtain recognition.

During the past fiscal year, the NLRB supervised 8,234 elections for more than half a million workers. The participation rate averaged 90 percent—compared to 62 percent in the last national political elections.

To make sure workers are given every possible chance to vote, NLRB workers have printed voting instructions in English, Polish, Hungarian, Greek, German, French, Chinese, and Yugoslavian.

And NLRB workers have had to hitch-hike via fishing boats in Alaska to give cannery workers opportunities to decide whether they wanted union representation or not.

Of course there have been complaints over the years. Someone always loses in an election.

It may be a union that is contesting against several other unions for the right to represent the workers. Or it may be a union running on a ballot against "no union."

The make-up of the NLRB and some of its rulings have been criticized by both labor and management through the years.

During the Roosevelt years the board was known as "anti-management." During the Eisenhower years it was known as "anti-labor."

The NLRB under the Kennedy and Johnson administrations has been criticized mostly by management as being "labor oriented."

Yet bloodshed as it was known in the pre-Wagner Act days is an exception rather than a rule today.

One of the secrets to the NLRB success is its strict emphasis on the word "secret" in its balloting.

A worker need fear neither management nor union retaliation because of his vote.

And majority vote rules—giving the union with a majority vote sole bargaining rights.

This majority rule tends to eliminate the confusion on the part of both unions and management that arise under some European systems where proportional representation voting is the rule.

Some states such as Massachusetts, after passage of the Federal Wagner Act, enacted so-called "Baby Wagner Acts."

These state boards are limited to intrastate commerce generally and their workload until a year ago was dropping.

Now, however, with municipal, town and state government workers seeking collective bargaining recognition, their role is on the increase.

If they can succeed with this knotty problem as well the Federal agency, perhaps in another decade labor and management will sit down to toast their success.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News,
Mar. 16, 1967]

NLRB'S 25 MILLIONTH

Back in 1935, Sen. Robert F. Wagner, father of the National Labor Relations Act, described his bill as based on the principle "that democracy cannot work unless it is

honored in the factory as well as the polling booth." In that year, almost half the labor disputes in the nation had as their major issue union recognition and the right to organize. Disputes were frequently marked by violence, often bloody and fatal.

Three decades later, in 1965, less than .03 of the man days lost by strikes resulted from walkouts to obtain recognition. And in the last fiscal year, the NLRB supervised 8,324 elections for more than half a million workers. The participation rate averaged 90 per cent, as against 62 per cent in the last national election.

The NLRB works, as Sen. Wagner knew it would. It works for labor and it works for management. If proof were needed, it came with what happened to Leonard P. Scheno of Carteret. Mr. Scheno, it turned out, was the 25-millionth worker to cast a ballot in an NLRB-supervised election. And he was feted in Washington by the AFL-CIO, the Electronic Industries Association and the National Association of Manufacturers. In 1935, such a joint celebration would have been unthinkable.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CASE ON OCCASION CELEBRATING 25 MILLIONTH VOTE IN NLRB ELECTIONS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my own remarks on the occasion of the luncheon celebrating the 25 millionth vote in National Labor Relations Board elections, held at the Robert Treat Hotel, in Newark, N.J., on March 27, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE 25 MILLIONTH VOTE IN NLRB ELECTIONS

(Partial text of remarks by Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE prepared for delivery at the Robert Treat Hotel in Newark, N.J., Mar. 27, 1967)

"Only in America." This could fittingly be the theme of our meeting here today.

Where else in the world would one find free labor and free management joining together in celebration of a process in which each must take its chances without surety of the outcome except that assurance which is, after all, the only real security any of us have—belief in the decency of our fellow man.

Passage of the National Labor Relations Act in 1935 began a new era in labor-management relationships in the United States. Bitter—and often bloody—struggles preceded its passage. The idea of government-supervised elections in which men and women workers could register, in privacy and free of intimidation, their desire to be represented or not by a union and, if so, by what union seemed almost revolutionary. Collective bargaining was given legal sanction that had been lacking before and a means provided to protect the rights of both labor and management.

Over the years, that policy embodied in the act has, on the whole, worked well. The first representational election conducted by the NLRB was held in December of 1935. It involved less than a thousand workers. In 1967, the Board will hold, I am informed, about 8,000 elections with more than a half-million eligible voters. These elections are the first step in the collective bargaining process which, far more than the public realizes, results in agreements reached without disruption of production or violence. In the last twenty years, there have been about 3,500 strikes each year as against 150,000 labor-management contracts in force. The time lost by strikes, all added together, amounts to less than two-tenths of one percent of the total time worked.

Over the years, both responsible labor and responsible management have come to a new respect for the rights of each other. Problems obviously remain and they are tough problems. For each step of technological progress has an impact on both employees and employers which neither can ignore. But they can be resolved by reasonable men who are willing to, in a phrase lately made famous, reason together.

This luncheon celebrating the 25-millionth vote cast in a secret election under the supervision of the NLRB would have been unthinkable twenty years ago. It is tangible vindication of the wisdom of a national policy based, in the words of the father of the act, on the principle "that democracy cannot work unless it is honored in the factory as well as the polling booth; and that men cannot be truly free in body and in spirit unless their freedom extends into the places where they earn their daily bread."

THE GUARANTEED STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, it has often and truly been said that our greatest resource is the potential of our people, particularly of our youth. Today as at no time in the past we are assisting through the Federal Government in developing that potential through education, and particularly through greater assistance than ever before to make possible higher education in college and university. As President Kennedy and President Johnson have stated it, our goal is to secure for each young person the greatest amount of education which he is capable of absorbing with profit.

The Higher Education Act of 1965, through title IV, followed very closely the lines of bills I introduced and advocated in the 87th and the 88th Congresses. These bills included proposals for work-study programs, first adopted under the poverty program in language largely identical to that of my own bill and later to become a part of title IV; for grants in aid, which were included in S. 2490, and whose basic concept and structure became a part of the act; and for federally guaranteed student loans, which I first proposed in the 87th Congress in S. 611, again in the 88th Congress in S. 1115, and which also was a part of S. 2490.

Consequently it has been gratifying to see these student assistance provisions operating. The 1966-67 academic year is the first full year in which these helps for college have been available, and already there has been some 480,000 loans totaling \$400 million made by banks under the Federal guarantee program. The financial columnist Sylvia Porter has recently discussed them in one of her syndicated articles.

Miss Porter notes that this is the time of year when students are eagerly awaiting acceptance to the college of their choice. She speaks of the problem, which the student loan program was specifically designed to relieve, of the middle-income family whose student is neither poor enough nor of high enough academic background to win scholarship support. It was this need to which I pointed repeatedly in connection with the guaranteed loan proposal, and it is gratifying to know that the law is acting

to fill that need, as Miss Porter points out.

I ask unanimous consent that the column entitled "Federal-Aid Loans Help College Students," written by Sylvia Porter, and published recently in the Louisville Times and other newspapers, be printed in the RECORD.

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

FEDERAL-AID LOANS HELP COLLEGE STUDENTS

(By Sylvia Porter)

NEW YORK.—These are the weeks when teen-agers and their parents are grabbing for the mail, eagerly searching for the special letter which will begin: "The Committee on Admissions is pleased to inform you that you have been accepted for admission to . . ."

We've just gone through it. Cris, 17, who is going on to college this fall, has received his letter and now Sumner and I are studying other mail which outlines "minimum" costs per college term and suggests what the "extras" can mount to.

Now I can appreciate how these costs can crush the middle-income family with youngsters who are just average students.

This family isn't poor enough to qualify for assistance on the basis of financial need. These youngsters haven't good enough grades to qualify for merit scholarships. And the interest rate-repayment terms on the typical education loans they could obtain aren't easy enough to soften the month-to-month pinch.

What then is the best answer?

The best answer is a low-cost college loan under the 1965 Higher Education Act's new program of federally guaranteed loans.

The 1966-67 academic year marks the first full year this program has been in operation. Although 480,000 loans totaling \$400 million have been made to date, millions of families have only a vague—if any—idea of what the program is. Thus, these questions and answers:

What are the key provisions of the program?

Under this program, long-term, low-interest loans are available to students attending or accepted for admission to an accredited institution of higher learning.

Regardless of your family's financial status, you, the student in good academic standing of an approved institution, are eligible for these loans, and the loans are made directly to you, not your parents. The objective is to encourage you to take over from your parents at least part of the financial burden of your education.

How much can the student borrow?

As an undergraduate student, you can borrow up to \$1,000 for each academic year of full-time study to a total of \$5,000. As a full-time student in graduate or a professional school, you can borrow as much as \$1,500 a year. The combined maximum for both undergraduate and postgraduate study is \$7,500.

What about interest charges on the loans?

The rate charged cannot be more than 6 per cent simple interest, meaning it's really 6 per cent a year and not double or more than double the stated rate as it may be on other popular forms of loans.

If the family's adjusted gross income is under \$15,000 a year, the federal government pays the entire 6 per cent interest cost while the student is in school, and pays half of this interest or 3 per cent during the period of loan repayment.

If the family's adjusted gross income is more than \$15,000, the student must pay the 6 per cent interest while he is in school and while he is repaying the loan. (Adjusted family income is total income minus \$600 for each exemption claimed.)

What are the repayment terms?

Monthly repayments do not start until nine months after you, the student, leave school. You may repay as little as \$360 a year. If you borrow more than \$2,000, you may have from five to 10 years after your graduation to repay in full. If you join the Peace Corps after college or if you enter military service, there is a special moratorium on payments.

Are there costs besides interest?

There may be an insurance premium up to ½ per cent per year on your unpaid principal balance.

A NEW DESIGN FOR THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, a meeting of great potential significance to everyone who uses the mails was held recently at Post Office Department headquarters. A group of the Nation's top engineers and scientists from private industry and the academic community attended the first meeting of the Post Office Department's Research and Engineering Advisory Council.

The Council is composed of 28 outstanding men who will advise and assist the Post Office in its efforts to make full use of our Nation's unmatched technological achievements in improving postal service.

I am informed that not a single person who was asked to serve on the Advisory Council refused to do so. This is an outstanding display of public spiritedness. I commend every member of the Advisory Council for his cooperation in the interest of better mail service for all Americans.

In his address at the first meeting of the Council, Postmaster General O'Brien outlined the problems the postal service faces and suggested some specific areas of study for the Council's immediate attention. I ask unanimous consent that Postmaster General O'Brien's address to the Council be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN AT THE FIRST MEETING OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT'S RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING ADVISORY COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 23, 1967

I am delighted to welcome you here this morning. This meeting marks the formal beginning of what I am confident will be a most fruitful and rewarding relationship, not just for the Postal Service but, more importantly, for the American public and the American business community we serve. I hope and trust you gentlemen will find this cooperative effort equally as rewarding.

This alliance between the Post Office, private industry and the academic community is an example of the creative federalism President Johnson is working so hard to foster as an integral part of our national policy and national life. All of our efforts to improve the quality of American society require the understanding, the cooperation, and the commitment of a broad range of private organizations.

Your presence here today testifies to your willingness to join in that effort. It was most gratifying to me and, I am sure, to Dr. Packer that not a single person we asked to serve on the Advisory Council refused. And I am well aware that time is one of your most precious commodities.

It is particularly fitting that the Post Office should call on private industry and the nation's educational system to assist us in improving postal service. The Post Office's importance to business, to education and to culture can hardly be overstated.

More than 80 per cent of all the mail we handle is generated by businesses or institutions. The Postal Service is the nation's primary artery of commerce, and, of course, the personal communications network of 190 million Americans.

Our schools and organizations supporting the arts depend heavily on the Postal Service. The Congress has recognized this by granting these groups preferential postal rates.

There is virtually no segment of our society that does not to some degree depend on the Postal Service. Our constituency, so to speak, stretches over the full social and economic fabric of our nation, as well as extending to its furthest geographical limits.

The task we face is enormous, at times almost frightening. This fiscal year we expect to process about 80 billion pieces of mail. The United States Post Office Department now handles as much mail as all the other nations of the world combined.

And mail volume seems never to have heard the old saying that everything that goes up must come down. It has been rising steadily, with relatively sharp increases over the past few years, reflecting the unprecedented economic expansion the nation has experienced since 1961.

In the last ten years annual mail volume has increased from 59 to 80 billion pieces. The postal workforce has grown from 521,000 to 700,000. And our annual expenditures have risen from \$3 billion to \$6.3 billion.

It has only been very recently, however, that we accelerated our interest in and attention to technology to match the rapid growth in our workload. The technological revolution was slow in coming to the Postal Service, but I believe the events of the past 12 to 18 months demonstrate that it has arrived in full force.

I think that fact was demonstrated by our request and Congress' approval last year of a new position of Assistant Postmaster General for Research and Engineering.

I think it was demonstrated by our selection of Dr. Packer to head the new Bureau of Research and Engineering.

I think it was demonstrated by establishment of this Advisory Council, composed, as it is, of outstanding engineers and scientists from throughout the nation.

And I think it was demonstrated by the postal budget President Johnson sent to Congress in January. Our spending request for the coming fiscal year can be described as a modernization budget—the first true modernization budget in postal history.

It calls for more than \$300 million in postal modernization expenditures. Included in our budget proposal are requests for an increase of 40 per cent in spending for research and engineering and a boost of 46 per cent in outlays for plant and equipment.

In announcing that he would recommend a postal rate increase, President Johnson stressed the necessity to move forward with postal modernization. He said the additional revenues produced by the proposed new rate structure would be used to finance an expanded postal modernization program and proposed pay raises for postal employees as well as reduce the substantial postal deficit.

Our 1968 budget also includes a new item—an item never before carried in a postal budget. This is a request for \$56 million in funds for the construction of new post offices.

In the past, all postal facilities built by the government were constructed under the supervision of the General Services Administration. Now, we have been delegated authority to build our own post offices.

And the Bureau of Research and Engineering has been given far-reaching new responsibilities in the construction process. Its involvement starts with the planning of new post offices and continues until they are in regular operation with all mechanization and mail handling systems working at peak efficiency.

We are determined not to repeat the mistakes of the past, when post offices were constructed as multi-purpose buildings or as general warehouses. Post offices must be designed and constructed as modern mail processing plants. They must be designed and constructed to accommodate the machines and the mail movement patterns that will be used in them.

We are aware that the job of postal modernization cannot be accomplished overnight. We know we cannot attach a booster filled with money to the Postal Service and thrust our mail delivery system dramatically into the space age.

We do not intend merely to throw money at the problem and wait for dividends to accrue in the form of better postal service. But neither do we intend to let matters drift back to the situation that existed just a few years ago—an ironic situation that saw the nation with the most advanced technology in the world all but ignoring research in its own Postal Service.

With your help, we intend to focus the full range of technological knowledge and ability on our efforts to develop a modern, highly-mechanized, efficient, economical mail delivery system. To achieve this goal, we must adapt what is best from private industry and significantly upgrade our own ability to do basic research.

Our problems and the solutions we are seeking cover the entire gamut of the mail delivery process. And, as I am sure Dr. Packer will stress, we view our various problems as parts of an integrated system rather than as separate, isolated difficulties. We believe the systems approach is the only logical way to close the technology gap and produce the kind of postal service the nation needs and has every right to demand.

We have a number of challenging areas for your immediate attention. The handling of mail while it is in a post office is the part of our operation that lends itself most readily to mechanization. Our ultimate goal is to develop a completely integrated mechanized system for processing and sorting various types of mail—a mechanized system capable of carrying the mail from where it enters the post office through to the point of dispatch.

The first and last phases of postal operations—pick-up and delivery—are less susceptible to mechanization of the type we normally deal with in the Post Office. But improved systems for collection of mail and for business and residential delivery in urban and suburban areas are needed.

And I can assure you, we will not hesitate to consider any ideas just because they are unique or represent a radical departure from traditional postal techniques. On the contrary, we are anxious to break new ground. We will not innovate merely for the sake of innovation, but we will not fear to break the old molds when new forms shape a better future.

Transportation, naturally, is another area of vital importance to the postal service. The traffic jams that plague our big cities and frustrate the average motorist also complicate and delay delivery of the mails.

Subways, the new high-speed trains that will soon begin running along the Northeast seaboard, and other types of proposed fast transit systems offer potential for improved mail service. We want to explore them all.

A related matter on which we seek the benefit of your wisdom and experience is

the development of better postal traffic management and control systems.

I have touched on just a few of the major areas we will ask you to venture into with us. The vistas are broad; the challenge is great.

This is, indeed, a time of change and a time of challenge for the postal service. The challenge is to meet the greatest flood of mail ever seen by man with the finest postal service in history.

With your help, I am confident we will prove equal to that challenge.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, just today Mr. O'Brien made an important statement on "A New Design for the Postal Service." He suggested that the postal service become a nonprofit Government corporation, managed by a professional executive.

It is unusual for a Cabinet member to suggest that his job be eliminated. I think that this is an indication of how strongly Mr. O'Brien believes in the recommendations he has made.

I feel certain that these recommendations will receive thoughtful consideration in Congress. In order that Senators may be informed about these plans, I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

A NEW DESIGN FOR THE POSTAL SERVICE
(Address by Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien, before the Magazine Publishers Association and the American Society of Magazine Editors, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C., April 3, 1967)

It is indeed a pleasure to be with you here today and to bring you the greetings of President Johnson.

You, collectively, form one of our greatest customers.

And we, the U.S. Post Office Department, form your greatest channel of distribution.

Certainly, there is a partnership of mutual interest and long concern existing between us, a fact reflected in the splendid cooperation given by MPA members to the Postal Service by donating valuable space as a public service to ZIP Code advertisements. My friends, I want to state again my thanks and appreciation for this voluntary and important effort.

The partnership that exists between us is also accorded unique recognition in the Postal Policy Act of 1958.

For the Act recognized that publishing, and the distribution of publications, form not just another business, but a national resource that has yielded enormous benefit to the nation throughout its history, and will continue, I am sure, to yield enormous benefit in the years to come.

It is a truism to recall the great diversity of this splendid country of ours—diversity in geography, in climate, in farm and industry, in race, in national origin.

We are so diverse that only extraordinary means could have held us together when so many forces seemed designed to tear us apart. There are a number of reasons why the United States did not become the dis-United States, and why we did not evolve into a North American Balkans.

There are many factors that combined and unified America. The process was carried on silently, almost in secret, underneath the temporary upheavals in our history. It moved by a chain of paper that transported the elements of Americanism through thousands of miles, across mountains and desert, from city to frontier, a chain stretching into every clearing and valley. This link consisted of the postal service and the publica-

tions—magazines and newspapers—that provided a common store of images, of heroes, of folklore, of truth, and of inspiration and ideals.

The American magazine industry has been a powerful force in the making of America, and of making America better, and I salute you and your industry which we strive to serve.

Occasionally I receive some slight indication that our effort to serve is meeting with success. Just a few days ago I received a letter from a patron in North Dakota, telling me of improved mail delivery. She said, "You just don't know how much prompt mail service means to my husband since he lost his mind."

I'm sure she wasn't referring to the delivery of magazines.

I notice there are an increasing number of magazine articles that deal with problems of the future of the postal service. I don't know whether this is because the present and the past are so dismal, but there is a noticeable trend, nonetheless.

Of course, the future has always fascinated man. And I suppose publishers have found . . . if I can sound TIMEY . . . that there are profits in being prophets.

But I'm afraid even the most optimistic prophets can't see much brightness in our future. Fortune tells us in bold capital letters that "Time is running out"—I wonder if the editor let that one slip by or if it's a subliminal hint to renew a sister publication—"Time is running out," the Fortune headline reads, "and trouble is spreading." "It's now or never for the Post Office." The Saturday Review tells us of "The Day the Mails Stopped." Newsweek tells "How To Float on a Sea of Red Ink." "What's the Matter With the Mails?" the Reporter asks plaintively. "What Ails the Post Office?" Nation wants to know. Reader's Digest finds a "Crisis in the Post Office." U.S. News & World Report gives me some company by reminding us of "A Question the World Over: 'What's Wrong With the Mails?'" and in its April 3rd issue it asks, "Can Anything Be Done About U.S. Mail Service?"

And so it goes. I apologize for those I've missed.

After reading some of those articles, I am reminded of the confused lady in Fresno whose car rolled smashing down the street after she got out to mail a letter. "Didn't you set the emergency brake?" asked the judge. "Emergency brake?" she said, surprised. "I didn't know mailing a letter was an emergency."

Well, despite the many problems we face, it still isn't an emergency—yet. In fact, if I may refer back to the April issue of U.S. News, I think there is something that can be done about the U.S. mail service. That something is to change the prescription we've been using to combat hardening of the postal arteries, and our chronic case of pernicious deficit. I believe another prescription is needed. In fact, I have given the nature of this prescription considerable—and increasing—thought since I became Postmaster General 17 months ago today.

We have made extensive progress in our effort to improve service. In fact, we have even taken some of the steps that you have been urging on us for years.

Though I am proud of what has been accomplished, the speed of our advance reminds me of the nature of battle in World War One. For every inch that we advance through shellhole, sticky mud, and poison gas, it is necessary to undertake a tremendous barrage, and expend whole divisions of energy and good will. Victories are measured in inches.

The reason for this painful and difficult progress is rooted not merely in volume, but more in the restrictive jungle of legislation and custom that has grown up around the Post Office Department in the 138 years since it joined Andrew Jackson's Cabinet.

In 1829, the Post Office Department was one of the principal policy arms of the Federal Government. During our history, we were the channel through which Federal assistance was provided to roadbuilding, the newly developed steamship, and the infant railroad and airline industries. It was important and necessary and right that there be a strong link between the postal service and the highest policy-making levels in the Executive Branch of our government. But those needs of the past no longer exist.

Since Andrew Jackson's time there have been more changes in the way people live and the way people think than had taken place in the previous thousand years. If the postal service had remained what it was in 1829, the situation would be a difficult one. But the truth, my friends, is that we are less able to meet changing needs today than was Amos Kendall, Jackson's Postmaster General, or Montgomery Blair, Lincoln's Postmaster General.

All institutions have a life of their own, and they either grow or die. Sometimes, like the dinosaur, they grow in ways that are harmful, they grow in self-destructive ways.

I think that is the path that has been taken by the postal service.

I have concluded that there are so many existing and formidable barriers to efficient management that the ultimate solution to the problems of the postal service lies in taking the Department out of its present context entirely.

I think the effort to patch a fabric so full of holes is yielding diminishing returns.

Let me cite just one example: In 1951, a parcel post law was passed which proved unworkable. During the period from 1951 to 1966, when the Parcel Post Reform Law was passed, there were close to 2 million words of testimony, from 244 witnesses. In addition, there were whole forests consumed for the amount of paper required for newspaper and magazine coverage of the issue. There were another 4 million words involved in exchanges over this matter with the Interstate Commerce Commission, and in debate in the Houses of Congress. For each page of testimony countless hours of research and preparation were required. The time of many talented people, on both sides of the issue, was consumed as quickly as cellophane in a bonfire.

And, as you are keenly and perhaps painfully aware, we are now engaged in requesting a rate increase, a task that will certainly place heavy burdens on already overburdened members of Congress.

If we ran our telephone system in this way, the carrier pigeon business would still have a great future, and I would sell my shares of AT&T—if I had any.

If we sought to build an atomic bomb in this way, we'd still be surveying sites in Tennessee, Washington, and New Mexico—or arguing about whether we should survey the sites.

Ladies and Gentlemen, the Post Office Department, as presently constituted, reminds me of the classic definition of an elephant—a mouse built to government specifications.

Recently I was asked a basic question about the organization of the Postal Service by the perceptive Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee, Representative Tom Steed of Oklahoma.

Chairman Steed asked, "General . . . would this be a fair summary: that at the present time as the manager of the Post Office Department, you have no control over your work load, you have no control over the rates of revenue that you are able to bring in, you have no control over the pay rates of the employees that you employ, you have very little control over the conditions of the service of these employees, you have virtually no control, by the nature of it, of the physical facilities that you are forced to use, and you have only a limited control at best over the transportation facilities that you are

compelled to use . . . ?" And then he added, this is " . . . a staggering amount of 'no control' in terms of the duties you have to perform."

I agreed with Chairman Steed. My area of "no control" is almost unlimited.

This is a situation that has grown up over such a long period of time and has such a strong tradition, that the only effective action I foresee is sweeping it away entirely.

And at this point permit me to say loud and clear that I am not focusing any criticisms on Congress for the manner in which the Postal Service is organized. Our organization is the product of evolution, and I think any candid assessment of the record will show that whenever real progress has been made during that evolutionary process, Congressional prodding has had much to do with it. For example, I recently received a strong prod myself from the Chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee—Senator Mike Monroney—concerning greater use of airlift for first class mail. So when we have moved down more enlightened paths, it has quite often been as a result of Congressional "marching orders."

The question is whether so much prodding would have been necessary if the managers of the postal service were themselves clearly and fully responsible for the Department's record.

As you know, I had some experience in the legislative area prior to becoming Postmaster General and I want to say that since taking on this job I have had the fullest cooperation from the Chairmen and members of our legislative and appropriations Committees. Senator Monroney, Chairman Steed, Chairman Dulski and their colleagues have at all times displayed the most intense interest in postal progress. They have often initiated and always supported our efforts to modernize, mechanize and plan for the future.

The conclusion I have reached has fully taken into account this meaningful partnership between the Executive Branch and the Congress. The partnership is meaningful, the relationships are excellent but together we occupy a vehicle no longer able to respond to the demands of the times.

Indifference, inflexibility, timidity are tenacious molds that grow in areas shaded by diffused responsibility. When *everybody* is responsible, as you well know from your own business operations, *nobody* is responsible.

If there is one lesson I have learned from many years in public service it is that when you give a man responsibility and hold him to it—then, and only then, do you get results.

A lifetime in politics has also helped me appreciate the value of compromise. But there are times when compromise is simply not possible. It's difficult to find grounds for compromise between a girl who wants a big church wedding and a boy who wants to break his engagement. And it's difficult to find a compromise between superlative service and cumbersome organization.

Shortly after I became Postmaster General I assigned the best talent I could find to a Task Force to study this problem. I have recently seen the results of the study made by this group. Their conclusions and my own are parallel.

And therefore I propose to you today that the postal service—

Should cease to be part of the President's Cabinet;

Should become a nonprofit government corporation, rendering essential public service;

Should provide postal services authorized by the Congress;

Should be operated by a board of directors, appointed by the President, and confirmed by the Congress;

Should be managed by a professional executive appointed by the board;

Should be given a clear mandate on the percentage of cost coverage for postal services, so that further revisions in rates—should they be necessary—would be made on a fixed formula basis.

And in addition, management and employees alike should be paid according to standards of comparable industries; and employees should be offered more incentive and scope as well as a wider area for collective bargaining.

Further, other steps should be taken to assure that the postal service reflects fully the genius of American management and industrial skills.

Through the establishment of a government corporation we would avoid the many statutory restrictions on appropriated funds which now exist. For example, the corporation would issue bonds to provide a capital fund with which to build appropriately designed and well equipped post office structures, which could also be self-amortizing through rental income.

I can report to you that I have made a general recommendation of this nature to the President, and he feels it worthy of intensive study. And in case there is any doubt, I want to state that while I am advocating the abolition of my own job, I would not under any circumstances take an executive position in the government corporation I am proposing.

During recent months a number of proposals have been made in the Congress to alter some aspects of the postal service. While all are well intentioned, they are only props for the tottering structure we now inhabit so uneasily.

I believe the time for props is past. I think we must stop tinkering and begin constructing.

The Constitution of the United States makes no mention of supporting farm prices, regulating the purity of food and drugs, the reclamation of arid land . . . but it does contain a mandate for Congress to establish post offices and post roads. The Founding Fathers understood clearly that, aside from the common defense, there are few services as important to a farflung nation than a postal service with the qualities of safety, certainty, celerity and economy. The United States is perhaps the most ingenious nation in the history of the world. I think it is about time that we devote considerably more of that ingenuity to the vital area of postal communications.

It is about time, because the volume that already threatens catastrophe is only the shadow of events to come.

We are close to the 200 million mark in our population.

Our gross national product approaches \$760 billion.

We are in the 74th month of unbroken and unprecedented economic expansion.

Our index of industrial production is 155% of what it was back in 1957 to 1959.

Personal income rose to \$610 billion a year as of February.

We are better educated than ever before. The average number of school years completed per citizen is at an all-time high of 11.8. More Americans are going to school than ever before. And the Federal, State and local governments are pouring almost \$30 billion into education, more than twice the entire national income of Spain and 70 per cent of the entire income of Italy.

In short, the United States right now has more people earning and learning than ever before.

What does this mean for the Postal Service? Simply that we are the mirror of this affluence, this rising standard of living and learning.

And, I might add, mail volume is growing faster than our population. For each year, despite the growth in telephone, teletype, and other electronic traffic, there is a rise in

the per capita number of letters sent by the American people. When I came to the Post Office Department the rate was one piece of mail per day for every man, woman and child: 365 pieces a year. Now we are anticipating a figure of 415 pieces of mail a year for every American.

Ladies and Gentlemen, some observers seem to view the Post Office Department as a kind of sponge that can absorb any amount, any increase, in mail. I am afraid the sponge is full.

We simply can't go on as we have been.

A number of magazine articles I cited earlier arrived at conclusions similar to that of Fortune: ". . . unless something is done soon to reform the service, the postal system is headed for an impossible situation."

The article commends the steps we have taken, such as accelerating our mechanization and modernization program; according new status to our research effort by upgrading it to the Assistant Postmaster General level and attracting to it many highly qualified engineers and scientists; setting up an Office of Planning and Systems Analysis so that resources may be employed in the right place, the right time, with the right emphasis; and providing for the most extensive electronic source data network in the world.

We have taken these steps, and we plan to take still others in the future. For example, on top of our \$100 million accelerated mechanization and modernization program, we are asking the Congress for an additional sum of \$300 million for the coming year—a sum already approved by the House of Representatives. But though meaningful progress has been and is being made—we still pull behind us the anchor of organization long ago surpassed by the general advance of our country.

I have today, given you my proposals on how we can move into the main stream of progress. I know my proposal is far-reaching; in fact, it has to be the most extensive proposal ever made in the history of the American postal service. But, I am firmly convinced, this is the only way to achieve the superlative postal service President Johnson has mandated, postal service worthy of the American Standard. And, I would like to ask you to cooperate with us, as you have so often in the past. A departure from tradition such as I propose requires public understanding and public support. There is no better vehicle for the creation of understanding and support than the powerful instrument of the American magazine industry. So, in closing, I ask for your help in bringing home to the people of this country the need for, and the nature of, the proposals I have made today.

President Johnson often recalls a statement once made by John F. Kennedy—that happiness lies in full use of your powers along lines of excellence. I think through the changes I suggest, we can build a postal service that uses, fully, its resources along lines of excellence, a result that, at long last, should make the American people happy with mail service.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FEDERAL LAND BANKS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, this year of 1967 marks the 50th anniversary of the Federal land banks, which were the forerunners and are now the senior elements of the extensive farm credit system in the United States.

Many Governors have proclaimed this month of April as "Federal Land Bank Month," because it was in April 1917 that the land banks commenced their service on behalf of American agriculture.

Moreover, April 3 is a particularly appropriate date for the Senate to take note of the land banks' golden anniversary because it was on this date, 50 years ago, that the process of chartering the 12 banks was completed.

The presidents of the 12 banks, boards of directors from the various farm credit districts, and members of the Federal Farm Credit Board have gathered in Washington today for commemorative meetings. Likewise, many local Federal land bank loan associations are holding 50th anniversary ceremonies today throughout the country.

All these events are aimed at going beyond the customary historical reviews and celebrations of the fact that, a half century ago, the first nationwide agricultural credit program was made available to this country's farmers.

The officers and directors of the land banks have made plans to dedicate this anniversary year to "America's farmers: providers of plenty," and backed it up with an informational program designed to inform the public to the vital importance of the tasks being performed by all who are engaged in agriculture.

The significance of agriculture to the United States or to any other country is a matter of much more than the volume of commodities produced, or the numbers of persons engaged in farming and ranching, or the size of farms, the amount of income they earn.

Most important, is the significance of these facts—and the statistics show that in agriculture, as in manufacturing and in science, the United States stands foremost among the nations of the world.

Throughout rural America, which has become inseparable in our economy and life from the need and the growth in our great urban regions, the Federal land banks have played a vital role in encouraging the growth that has led to the leadership of the United States in the field of agriculture.

Fifty years ago, as the United States moved toward involvement in World War I, and later when we fought in World War II, it became clear that America's farms would be responsible for great production requirements.

In order to back our goals, it was necessary to insure adequate food and fiber for our fighting forces and for the entire population working at home, and for other countries and their fighting forces.

Unlike the manufacturing industries, however, agriculture 50 years ago had no sound, dependable, and adaptable source of credit for obtaining the capital inputs required to step up production.

For many years prior to 1917, this plight of the farmer had been studied with concern by distinguished governmental and agricultural leaders. In 1912, for example, the national conventions of both major political parties adopted planks urging the improvement of agricultural credit facilities.

Such facilities were made possible with the enactment of the original Federal Farm Loan Act, in 1916. During the months that followed, the 12 farm credit districts were laid out, to conform with regional geographic differences, the banks were established, and their local loan associations were formed.

The first long-term farm real estate loans were then closed during April of 1917.

The farmers and livestock growers of America were given access, for the first time in history, to a national source of credit, one which enabled them to begin operating in accordance with modern business principles comparable to those followed in commerce and industry.

The new credit program also gave the farmer and rancher a built-in, self-interest in its success, because of the stipulation that each person borrowing from a local land bank association must purchase stock in the system, equal to 5 percent of the loan.

This provision still holds true today, giving emphasis to the fact that the present 400,000 farmers and ranchers currently holding land bank loans are in fact the owners of the banks and associations. Their collective collateral, representing much of the finest agricultural property in the country, offers security to investors in the land bank system.

The use of capital, through credit, has enabled those engaged in agriculture to adapt for farm and ranch purposes the benefits of the new technologies and the results of research in many diverse areas relating to land, crops, and livestock.

As a consequence, America's agriculture has achieved 50 years of great progress, through wars and depression, continually increasing its capacity to produce, and creating ever greater abundance.

Moreover, a thriving, forward-moving agriculture sustains thousands on thousands of jobs for those industries which provide farm equipment, supplies and services, as well as for the many more industries which process food and fiber into consumer products.

Through the years, the Federal land banks have innovated, pioneered, and set the pace for the sound utilization of credit. The manner in which the land banks have grown in influence and scope of operations is indicative of the strength, virility, and growth of commercial agriculture in America.

For example, the Federal Land Bank of Louisville, in my State of Kentucky, commenced operations with an initial capitalization of \$750,000, the amount of capital on which each of the 12 banks started.

A good part of the initial stock had been subscribed by the U.S. Government. During the depression, many millions more dollars in emergency funds were handled by the Louisville bank to rescue farmers from financial disaster.

By 1940, all Government funds had been paid back to the Treasury. Today the Federal Land Bank of Louisville's capital amounts to \$50 million.

During the first 5 years of the Louisville bank's existence, loans totaling \$38 million were made to farmers in Kentucky and the neighboring States of Ohio, Indiana, and Tennessee. Compare that amount with the \$170 million in loans made during the single calendar year of 1966.

Current total long-term real estate loans outstanding reported in the four-State area by the Louisville bank amount

to \$570 million, and in Kentucky alone 14 Federal land bank associations are serving 7,000 farm families with loan balances of almost \$100 million.

Land bank financing supports a wide diversity of agricultural activity in Kentucky, ranging from large farming operations on excellent land to smaller farms in the mountainous counties. In addition to its famous bluegrass, Kentucky is especially noted for its production of high-quality Burley tobacco, which accounts for approximately one-third of my State's farm income.

In the 50 years since the Federal Land Bank of Louisville was established, several thousand Kentucky farmowners have used the credit services of land bank associations; many can attribute their debt-free farm and home ownership to the amortization of their indebtedness with land bank loans.

Throughout the half century, the Louisville bank has provided \$1.4 billion worth of long-term credit to farmers in its four-State area.

Let me add, Mr. President, that the Louisville bank has not had to take over the ownership of a farm in 25 years. All of the 12 Federal land banks report an extremely low delinquency rate—less than 3 percent—and exceedingly small losses. Since 1917, the entire system has made loans to more than 2 million farmers and ranchers, totaling \$14 billion. Losses in that 50-year span have amounted to \$128 million, or less than 1 percent. This is a truly remarkable record of financial stability, an eloquent testimony to the integrity of the modern, businessman-farmer.

The accomplishments and experience in Kentucky, and the record of the Federal land banks across the Nation, attest to the role which they have played in the use of credit to encourage the expansion of American agriculture.

A comparison of farm production today with the methods of 50 years ago shows the great variety and the great efficiency which has resulted from credit made available from sources such as the Federal land banks, and it also shows clearly the enterprise and hard work of the American farmer.

In fact, the abundance of American agriculture, and the benefits it has brought to all Americans, can serve as examples for other countries seeking economic independence and self-sufficiency as they develop their political and economic systems.

Agriculture was our country's first great enterprise, and supplying food the first concern to those who settled this country and helped it grow.

In recent years, there has been a revolution in production technology. The sharp distinctions between city and country people are disappearing, but the great importance of food and agricultural production is unchanged.

In war and peace, American agriculture has met every requirement placed upon it, and it has sustained our Nation. As we enter a new age in agriculture, I know it will continue to do so.

A few years ago, surplus production was considered a nearly insoluble problem. But today, we must think about feeding the growing population of the

world, about the place of agriculture and farm families in the future of our Nation, and the place of our Nation's agriculture in the future of all peoples.

The Federal land banks have played a central part in agricultural progress, and they will continue to contribute a full share to the remarkable cooperation, understanding, and creativity of farm people and the Nation.

Mr. President, for all of these reasons, I am proud to speak today about this experience of our people who live and work on the farms of America, and about the cooperation and assistance provided by the Federal land banks.

It was my privilege to serve for 10 years on the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I recall the many programs which have received the consideration and support of the Senate and of the Congress.

Today, as the Federal land banks observe their 50th anniversary, and as members of their associations are meeting in Washington, the Congress and the people of our country salute the remarkable contributions which they have made, and we offer our encouragement for future growth which will benefit those who live on our farms and the whole Nation.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. 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. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 6950, Order No. 80.

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

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That sections 48(j) and 167(i) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (defining suspension period) are each amended by striking out "December 31, 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 9, 1967".

Sec. 2. Section 46(a) (2) of the Internal

Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to limitation on investment credit based on amount of tax) is amended—

(1) by striking out subparagraphs (B) and (C) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(B) for taxable years ending before January 1, 1968, 25 percent of so much of the liability for tax for the taxable year as exceeds \$25,000, or

"(C) for taxable years ending after December 31, 1967, 50 per cent of so much of the liability for tax for the taxable year as exceeds \$25,000."; and

(2) by striking out the next to the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "In applying subparagraph (C) to a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1968, and ending after December 31, 1967, the percent referred to in such subparagraph shall be the sum of 25 percent plus the percent which bears the same ratio to 25 percent as the number of days in such year after December 31, 1967, bears to the total number of days in such year."

Sec. 3. Section 48(a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to property used outside the United States) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (B) (1) "or is operated under contract with the United States".

Sec. 4. The amendments made by the first section and section 3 of this Act shall apply to taxable years ending after March 9, 1967.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. 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. BYRD of West Virginia. 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. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for the House bill be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, be treated as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is agreed to, and is considered as original text for the purpose of amendment.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, H.R. 6950 is a bill which restores the investment credit and certain uses of the accelerated methods of depreciation. These tax incentives to business investment were suspended temporarily last fall after an unusual combination of circumstances created severe inflationary pressures in the areas of the economy most closely affected by them. The unusual conditions have eased so that it is now appropriate to restore these tax provisions.

THE SITUATION LAST FALL

Inflationary pressures developed last year when it became necessary to increase Vietnam expenditures rapidly just as the economy, after 5 years of expansion, neared full employment levels of output. At the same time, and perhaps as a result of the circumstances I just mentioned, businessmen sharply increased appropriations for new plant and equipment.

A number of steps were taken to meet these pressures. Fiscal actions, includ-

ing the enactment of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966—which restored certain excise taxes, speeded up corporate payments, and provided for graduated withholding—withheld roughly \$10 billion of business and consumer purchasing power from the economy. Concurrently, the monetary authorities—the Federal Reserve Board—took steps to restrain increases in the supply of credit.

As the year progressed, it became obvious that monetary restrictions were exerting an uneven impact on the economy. Business investors were not deterred by credit restrictions and succeeded in increasing their share of the available funds. As a result, interest rates were pushed up to the highest levels in 40 years and the supply of credit in certain other areas of the economy was severely curtailed. The flow of funds into home mortgages was virtually stopped in most areas of the country and, as a result, residential construction was depressed. The number of new housing starts fell by 50 percent during the year while boom conditions in the machinery and equipment industries resulted in lengthening backlogs, rising prices, and increased imports.

Under these unusual circumstances, selected measures to restrain inflationary pressures in the machinery and equipment industries were needed so that the monetary restrictions which were pressing so heavily on other areas of the economy could be eased. The administration recommended and Congress approved the suspension of the investment credit and of certain uses of accelerated depreciation beginning on October 10, 1966.

THE CURRENT SITUATION

The pressures evident last fall have eased. The latest Government survey of business investment plans indicates a planned increase in plant and equipment expenditures of only 3.9 percent this year over last year. This modest increase contrasts sharply with the increase of 16.7 percent that took place last year. The increase now planned for 1967, if achieved, will be the smallest percentage increase in plant and equipment spending since 1961. Of course, we believe these investments will increase if Congress restores the 7-percent investment credit.

Pressures on the capital goods industry have eased. Backlogs of unfilled orders for machinery and equipment have been reduced and the extent of overtime work has decreased. In the economy at large, interest rates have fallen substantially from the peak levels of last fall. The flow of savings has increased and mortgage lenders have more funds available. The pace of residential construction has shown signs of rebounding.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to turn to the committee report, at page 10, and read beginning with the last paragraph on that page. First, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD table 7, "Bond Yields and Interest Rates," which appears on page 11 of the report.

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

TABLE 7.—Bond yields and interest rates
(Percent per annum)

Period	U.S. Government security yields			High-grade municipal bonds (Standard & Poor's) ⁴	Corporate bonds (Moody's)		Prime commercial paper, 4 to 6 months	FHA new home mortgage yields ⁵
	3-month Treasury bills ¹	3- to 5-year issues ²	Taxable bonds ³		Aaa	Baa		
1960.....	2.928	3.99	4.02	3.73	4.41	5.19	3.85	6.16
1961.....	2.378	3.60	3.90	3.46	4.35	5.08	2.97	5.78
1962.....	2.778	3.57	3.95	3.18	4.33	5.02	3.26	5.60
1963.....	3.157	3.72	4.00	3.23	4.26	4.86	3.55	5.46
1964.....	3.549	4.06	4.15	3.22	4.40	4.83	3.97	5.45
1965.....	3.954	4.22	4.21	3.27	4.49	4.87	4.35	5.46
1965—December.....	4.881	5.16	4.65	3.82	5.13	5.67	5.55	6.29
1966—January.....	4.362	4.7	4.43	3.56	4.68	5.02	4.65	5.51
1966—February.....	4.596	4.89	4.43	3.52	4.74	5.06	4.82	5.62
1966—March.....	4.670	5.02	4.61	3.63	4.78	5.12	4.88	5.70
1966—April.....	4.626	4.94	4.63	3.72	4.92	5.32	5.21	6.00
1966—May.....	4.611	4.86	4.55	3.59	4.96	5.41	5.38	6.32
1966—June.....	4.642	4.94	4.57	3.68	4.98	5.48	5.39	6.45
1966—July.....	4.539	5.01	4.63	3.77	5.07	5.58	5.51	6.51
1966—August.....	4.855	5.22	4.75	3.94	5.16	5.68	5.63	6.58
1966—September.....	4.932	5.58	4.80	4.17	5.31	5.83	5.85	6.63
1966—October.....	5.356	5.62	4.79	4.11	5.49	6.09	5.89	6.81
1966—November.....	5.387	5.38	4.70	3.97	5.41	6.10	6.00	6.77
1966—December.....	5.344	5.43	4.74	3.93	5.35	6.13	6.00	6.81
1967—January.....	5.007	5.07	4.65	3.83	5.39	6.18	6.00	6.81
Week ended (1967):	4.759	4.71	4.40	3.58	5.20	5.97	5.73	6.77
1967—Jan. 14.....	4.818	4.76	4.40	3.62	5.32	6.08	5.85	6.81
1967—Jan. 21.....	4.716	4.65	4.37	3.43	5.15	5.92	5.68	6.81
1967—Jan. 28.....	4.680	4.68	4.39	3.43	5.04	5.83	5.55	6.81
1967—Feb. 4.....	4.486	4.64	4.37	3.45	5.02	5.81	5.40	6.81
1967—Feb. 11.....	4.530	4.67	4.41	3.47	5.00	5.82	5.38	6.81
1967—Feb. 18.....	4.577	4.76	4.49	3.62	5.01	5.82	5.38	6.81
1967—Feb. 25.....	4.621							
1967—Mar. 10.....	4.344							
1967—Mar. 17.....	4.308							

¹ Rate on new issues within period.

² Selected note and bond issues.

³ April 1953 to date, bonds due or callable 10 years and after.

⁴ Weekly data are Wednesday figures.

⁵ Data for 1st of the month based on the maximum permissible interest rate (6 percent beginning October 1966) and 30-year mortgages paid in 15 years.

⁶ Not charted.

Sources: Treasury Department, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Federal Housing Administration, Standard & Poor's Corp., and Moody's Investors Service.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, reading from page 10 of the committee report, it is stated:

There is growing evidence that conditions in the money market also are easing. Interest rates, shown in table 7, have fallen from their 1966 highs. For example, interest rates on 3-month Treasury bills reached a peak in October 1966 of 5.387 percent per annum. Since that time, interest rates on these bills have declined steadily. On March 13, the Treasury marketed 3-month bills with a rate of interest of 4.31 percent per annum, more than a full percentage point below the average October rate. Interest rates on other Treasury issues, municipal bonds, corporate bonds, commercial paper, and home mortgages have generally followed a similar pattern.

Recent actions by the Federal Reserve Board suggest that further monetary ease will be encouraged. The Reserve Board announced that the reserves required against savings deposits by member banks would be reduced from 4 percent to 3 percent of such deposits. This action increases the ability of the member banks to make loans. The first step in the program went into effect on March 1 and increased the free reserves of member banks to a "plus" free-reserve position of \$165 million, the highest free-reserve position since December 1964. The free reserves of member banks reached a "minus" position of more than \$400 million during the period of monetary stringency in 1966. The step taken by the Federal Reserve Board was made possible by a general easing of inflationary pressures throughout the economy as well as by the easing of pressures in the capital goods industries.

THE TAX PROVISIONS SHOULD BE RESTORED

Since the pressures which made the suspensions necessary have abated, it is

appropriate now to restore these tax incentive provisions. The suspensions have served their purpose. Restoring the provisions will not promote a re-emergence of excessive investment spending. The present planned rate of business investment spending is sufficiently far below last year's overheated pace that a moderate increase in such investment would not upset the balance of the economy, but rather, we believe, bring it into better balance.

When the suspensions were approved last fall, a definite date was provided for their restoration simply to emphasize that the suspensions were to be temporary. The report of the Finance Committee and testimony by administration witnesses made it clear that restoration would be urged as soon as conditions in the economy permitted. That moment has now arrived.

MODIFICATIONS MADE IN THE HOUSE BILL

While your committee is in full agreement with the House of Representatives that the investment credit and accelerated depreciation should be restored as of March 10, we have modified the House provision which would have changed the definition of property to be denied the benefit of the special tax provisions. We concluded that the provisions of the House bill in this respect would establish an unfortunate precedent, and would be costly in terms of revenue. We also believe that the treatment we provide is fairer to all.

The House bill would restore retroactively the suspended tax provisions for

much, but not all, of the property ordered or commenced during the suspension period.

Under existing law, which the committee's bill retains, the investment credit is generally to be denied to property ordered, acquired, ordered to be constructed, or on which construction has begun by the taxpayer during the suspension period. Also under present law, the use of accelerated methods of depreciation is to be denied to buildings whose construction has begun or is ordered during the suspension period, the suspension period running from October 10, 1966 to March 9, 1967, inclusive.

Under the House bill, the investment credit would have been denied only to property that was acquired by the taxpayer during the suspension period. It would not be denied to property ordered during that period and acquired afterward. With respect to accelerated depreciation buildings, or investment credit property constructed by the taxpayer, the applicable tax provisions would have been denied only to that portion of the property attributable to construction which took place before March 10, 1967. In other words, the benefits would be prorated.

These provisions of the House bill, in our opinion, do not treat similarly situated taxpayers the same in at least two types of situations. In the first place, the House provision creates a problem with respect to those taxpayers who postponed investments because they believed that Congress meant what it said last fall when it suspended these provisions. These taxpayers would not have forfeited their place in line with equipment suppliers or have delayed construction if they thought Congress would reverse itself and make the investment credit and accelerated depreciation available for most of the property concerned.

They waited to make their investment commitments because they felt the benefits of the investment credit, or of accelerated depreciation, outweighed the disadvantage of allowing competitors to get earlier delivery or completion of new equipment. If the Senate were now to approve the House bill, these taxpayers would find that they have lost valuable time to their competitors, who would have gained not only time but also, in some instances, all of the suspended credit. Such a result would be unfair to those who acted in a manner that was, after all, the intended purpose of the suspensions.

The fact is, as Senators know—the whole purpose of passing the suspension bill was to get the people to stop ordering and constructing buildings and plant equipment. We wanted to slow down the economy. Many people believed us and they stopped buying. We said, "If you will wait until a specified date, we will give you back your 7-percent investment credit, but we cannot have this 17-percent increase over the year previously because investing is at too high a rate." Thus, we suspended it. We hoped that everybody would take us at our word. Thus, we have seen the increase in plant and equipment expenditures drop from 17 percent to 3.9 percent. In other

words, it has now dropped a little bit too much. If we do what the House wants us to do, give back to those people who ordered, anyway, the 7-percent investment credit, despite our request that they not invest, we would be giving them a tax advantage which their competitors who did what we wanted would not get.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for a question?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. What is the dollar difference between the House bill and the Senate version of the bill?

Mr. SMATHERS. The dollar difference? The House bill is \$775 million more expensive. Thus, the Finance Committee version saves considerably more money.

Mr. INOUE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kansas, a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] mentioned the fact that revenue is involved in this measure. I think the record should show that, based on the testimony of Secretary of the Treasury Fowler on one or two occasions, this is not a revenue-producing bill.

I refer to page four of his statement made on Monday, September 12, 1966, as follows:

This proposal is not a tax reform proposal—it is temporary in design and purpose.

He is specific about it.

Continuing to read:

It is not a revenue-raising proposal in purpose or objective; any revenue aspects are only incidental. So we do not come here today with any new estimates of revenues or expenditures for fiscal 1967.

I think that the distinguished acting minority leader and the ranking chairman of the Committee on Finance, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], would agree with me that this is—

Mr. SMATHERS. Was not that statement made at the time we were working on the suspension bill.

Mr. CARLSON. This was on Monday, September 12, 1966.

Mr. SMATHERS. Yes; that was last year.

Mr. CARLSON. I think the Senator from Florida would agree with me that when we originally passed the bill, we never thought it would be a revenue-producing measure, but one which would strengthen the economy of the country.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is absolutely correct as to the suspension bill. However, when the Secretary of the Treasury was before us a couple of weeks ago, with respect to the reinstitution of the 7-percent investment credit, he demonstrated that he was concerned about the budget.

I have just been handed a letter which he wrote, dated March 21, 1967, addressed to me, as acting chairman, which reads as follows:

DEAR SENATOR SMATHERS: My purpose in writing this letter is to make quite clear my position on the restoration of the investment

credit and the House bill, H.R. 6950, now before the Senate Finance Committee. I believe it is appropriate for me to do so at this time in the light of the events and discussion bearing on the question of restoring the credit which have occurred since the President's recommendation to the Congress on March 9, 1967.

There are two paramount concerns involved in the restoration of the investment credit: one is to assure restoration on the investment credit to its long-run functioning role in our tax structure, now that suspension has served its purpose, which the Congress and the Administration assumed the obligation to do when enacting the suspension legislation.

Here is what I want especially to get into the RECORD:

The other major concern is to protect revenues and the budgetary position of the Federal Government.

Thus, as between the date the Senator from Kansas quoted on the Secretary's testimony last September, and March 26 of this year, the Secretary reconsidered the need for decreasing the size of what was his concern with respect to revenue. This obviously was because we are going to have a rather substantial deficit, this year and next.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. Is it to be my understanding, then, that the Secretary has indicated he wants to reduce the loss of revenue which he claims will occur unless the bill as reported by the Senate Finance Committee is adopted?

Mr. SMATHERS. He is concerned about the loss to the Treasury that will result if the version of the bill the Senate Finance Committee reported is not adopted. The bill as passed by the House would result in a greater loss to the Treasury than the Senate Finance Committee bill. That is one of his concerns.

Mr. HARTKE. As indicated in his statements and his letter to you, he prefers the Senate Finance Committee bill because, according to his interpretation, it will reduce the revenue loss by a smaller amount than will the House version of the bill?

Mr. SMATHERS. That is one reason why he prefers the Senate Finance Committee bill over the House version.

Mr. HARTKE. I understand; but it is his contention that there will be a smaller loss of revenue by adoption of the Senate Finance Committee bill rather than the House version of the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARTKE. I wonder whether the Senator from Florida might clarify the statement of the majority of the committee in the report where it states there will be a revenue feedback and whether, in fact, there will be a feedback.

Mr. SMATHERS. I think there will be a feedback when once again we reinstitute the 7-percent investment credit.

Mr. HARTKE. On page 14 it states, and I quote:

Higher levels of investment spending in turn will mean higher incomes in the industries that supply, directly or indirectly, such

goods and, in this manner, increase tax receipts.

Is that correct or incorrect?

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct. I do not see anything inconsistent in this with what I have said. The Finance Committee report makes it clear that the feedback effects is not in the estimates presented in the report.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator is saying that by adopting a provision that will result in a lesser amount of tax receipts the feedback will be more or less?

Mr. SMATHERS. It probably will be less because of the feedback. Isn't that what the Senator is getting at?

Mr. HARTKE. I am saying there is an inconsistency in the approach. The Senator cannot say that by cutting taxes—

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the Senator want to ask me a question on my time, or does he want to make a speech on my time? I shall be glad to yield to him.

Mr. HARTKE. I will ask a question.

Mr. SMATHERS. Very well.

Mr. HARTKE. Is it the contention of the Senator from Florida and the Secretary of the Treasury that by cutting taxes we will increase or decrease revenues? The Senator cannot have it both ways. It is either an increase or a decrease.

Mr. SMATHERS. I think the Senator is looking at it in the short term. When taxes are cut, revenues are reduced for the moment because the taxes are reduced. But the moneys left in the economy have the effect of stimulating the economy, so that frequently, even though taxes are lowered, revenues may be greater. This is not a theory that is new. It has been proven for a long time and it has been proved to be sound. Of course, one might say, "Let us eliminate all taxes if cutting taxes stimulates the economy." That, of course, would not increase revenues. What we are trying to achieve is a balance.

Mr. HARTKE. What will be the effect of this bill on 1968 revenues? I refer to the revenue effect of the bill on the 1968 budget, which will begin on July 1, 1967.

Mr. SMATHERS. We have the estimate of the staff. Of course, these are estimates.

Mr. HARTKE. I appreciate that it is a difficult position to be in.

Mr. SMATHERS. We are doing the best we can. The feedback results, which are not included in these estimates, depend on many factors.

Mr. HARTKE. But this body suspended the investment tax credit; now it can reinstitute it.

Mr. SMATHERS. The revenue loss estimated under the Finance Committee measure for 1967 will be \$145 million without any feedback effect.

Mr. HARTKE. Is that for fiscal 1967?

Mr. SMATHERS. Fiscal 1967.

Mr. HARTKE. For fiscal 1967 the revenue loss will be how much?

Mr. SMATHERS. One hundred and forty-five million dollars.

Mr. HARTKE. Is that—

Mr. SMATHERS. Let me finish.

Mr. HARTKE. May I clarify it?

Mr. SMATHERS. No. Let me first read these figures. Then the Senator can clarify it.

In 1968 the revenue loss will be \$460 million.

In 1969 it will be \$405 million.

In 1970 it will be \$75 million.

Mr. HARTKE. Ninety-five million dollars?

Mr. SMATHERS. No; \$75 million. So the total loss between the years 1967 and 1970 will be \$1,085 million.

Mr. HARTKE. For the 4-year period?

Mr. SMATHERS. Yes.

Mr. HARTKE. Does the revenue loss take into account any feedback?

Mr. SMATHERS. No.

Mr. HARTKE. What is the estimate as to the amount of feedback?

Mr. SMATHERS. We do not have the feedback effect but it is undoubtedly less than either of the two loss figures.

Mr. HARTKE. Between what two figures?

Mr. SMATHERS. Let me say this to the Senator. I know he knows as much about this as I do.

Mr. HARTKE. I am trying to find the answer to a very pertinent point. I think the manager of the bill ought either to help Senate debate by having these figures available or else the bill ought to go back to the committee to insure its being fully informed before reporting such a measure.

Mr. SMATHERS. We do not know what the feedback effect will be. We know it will have some effect and therefore lessen the losses shown. We do not know who is going to construct a building. We do know who has ordered a building.

Mr. HARTKE. Does anybody know?

Mr. SMATHERS. There is no way we can exactly predict what is going to happen in 1969 and 1970. I know the Senator would love to have those figures. I would love to be able to reach up into the sky and bring them down for him.

Mr. HARTKE. Does the Senator feel that these are estimates of the Secretary of the Treasury? Are the estimates on page 15 of the report, from which table the Senator has read, estimates by the Treasury Department?

Mr. SMATHERS. The only thing we can say is that they are figures as to what the revenue loss is estimated to be, as appears on page 15 of the report.

Mr. HARTKE. Which figures do not take into account the feedback?

Mr. SMATHERS. No; the feedback is not included. In any event there will be little if any feedback from the revenue picked up over the House bill since these are orders already placed. No incentive for more orders arises from giving the credit for these past orders.

We hope, naturally, that there will be stimulation of the economy from the restoration of the credit. That is why we are putting the 7-percent tax credit back into the law.

Mr. HARTKE. Does the Treasury Department say that is what we are doing?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Treasury Department is very much concerned that the investment program has dropped from a 17-percent increase to 3.9 percent this year. We think that is too low. We felt that 17 percent was too high. That is what the administration thinks. That is what a majority of the Senate Finance Committee thinks.

Mr. HARTKE. Does the Treasury Department think that this proposal will or will not increase investments?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator knows there are other reasons why the Treasury is supporting this bill. I have been stating a couple of them in my speech. I repeat them in brief. We are doing this because, first, we are trying to get an increase in plant and equipment investment, an expansion of the economy. We are trying to stimulate it to some extent so that it will get to a level of perhaps 7 or 8 percent. We took off the investment tax credit last year because investment was running at too fast a rate. Now we have a different economy than we had in 1966. Some of the indicators are pointing downward. We are trying to stimulate the economy somewhat. That is one reason for urging the bill.

Another reason why the Secretary of the Treasury wants the Finance Committee measure over the House program is that the House went a little further than the Senate committee and negated the investment tax credit suspension. The House went so far as to enable people who had gone ahead in spite of the suspension of the tax credit to get a portion of their taxes back. So the Secretary prefers the Finance Committee measure. We are trying, generally, to get the economy moving forward again in this particular important area.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I think it well that there be placed in the RECORD what the Secretary of the Treasury said, as appears on page 86 of the hearings. I read from a letter written to the Senator from Florida:

There are two paramount concerns involved in the restoration of the investment credit: one is to assure restoration of the investment credit to its long-run functioning role in our tax structure, now that suspension has served its purpose, which the Congress and the Administration assumed the obligation to do when enacting the suspension legislation. The other major concern is to protect revenues and the budgetary position of the Federal Government.

I do not agree with the budgetary position, but I agree with the first section.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Kansas. I might state that we had put that in the RECORD, but not in its entirety.

Mr. HARTKE. Will the Senator from Florida agree that the estimates contained in the report of the Committee on Finance, under table 10, are only estimates of revenue losses, without giving any consideration to feedback?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct. I do not, however, see a table on page 10.

Mr. HARTKE. Table 10 on page 15; designated as table No. 10.

Mr. SMATHERS. Yes. The Senator from Indiana will agree that anything shown as happening in 1970 has to be an estimate, will he not?

Mr. HARTKE. I will agree that anything shown as happening in 1970 is an estimate. What I am asking the Senator

from Florida is whether or not he agrees that it is an estimate.

Mr. SMATHERS. I have been telling the Senator over and over again that it is an estimate.

Mr. HARTKE. What I am asking the Senator, then, is whether it is an estimate on the basis of revenue loss only. The statement is made in the majority committee report that higher levels of investment spending will mean higher incomes in the industries that supply, directly or indirectly, such goods, and in that manner increase tax receipts.

I am asking the Senator from Florida whether he or any of his advisers, including the Treasury Department, the Council of Economic Advisers, the Federal Reserve Board, or the fourth member of the quadriad, the Director of the Budget, or any of their experts, have made any direct estimates as to how much revenue will be realized as a feedback or a reciprocal action in regard to these increased tax receipts which the report says will occur.

Mr. SMATHERS. We do not have any estimates as to the feedbacks.

Mr. HARTKE. No estimates as to the feedbacks; therefore—

Mr. SMATHERS. Just a moment. The Senator has asked a lengthy question; I am sure he would not want a short answer.

We believe there will be a feedback. As to what the extent of the feedback will be, I have not seen any figures supplied by the Treasury Department or the staff, but we believe in the short run it will be less than the revenue loss.

But it would seem, on the earlier premise, that if we reduce taxes in this area, and encourage people, once again, to start building plants and buildings and buying equipment, that there will be a sizable feedback which will reduce the loss to the Treasury over the long run.

Mr. HARTKE. Is the position, then, of the Senator from Florida, that the amount by which the budgets of 1967, 1968, 1969, and 1970 will be affected is represented by those amounts which are contained in the table on page 15, which is designated as table 10, or will it be by a lesser amount?

Mr. SMATHERS. We believe it will be by a lesser amount, because of the feedback. But again, I wish to say that these figures for 1968 are estimates. This is 1967. The figures for 1969 and 1970 are likewise estimates.

The table is an estimate. We are doing the best we can with it.

Mr. HARTKE. Then is it fair to say that the effect upon the budget for fiscal year 1968 will not be an increase in the deficit of \$910 million, as contained in the table?

Mr. SMATHERS. It is not fair to say anything precisely. Our best estimate is that the figures here will be somewhat less because of the feedback. To what extent, we do not know.

Mr. HARTKE. Will the feedback, in the opinion of the Senator from Florida, be more or less, in comparison to the amount of tax reduction that is given to the industry?

Mr. SMATHERS. It will not offset the full revenue loss.

Mr. HARTKE. Will it be more or less by a greater amount than the tax cut?

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not believe that I exactly follow what the Senator is asking. Let me say this—

Mr. HARTKE. Permit me to restate the question, so there will be no misleading.

The House bill, which the Treasury insisted could not be modified, and then came before the Committee on Finance and insisted that it should be modified, as they now insist that the Senate bill shall not be modified, would have an estimated revenue effect of minus \$1.860 billion, is that correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct.

Mr. HARTKE. And the effect on the estimate is reduced to \$1.085 billion as a result of the Finance Committee's action?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARTKE. Which means that as far as the difference in the two is concerned, the revenues apparently would be increased by \$775 million as a result of the Finance Committee's action?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARTKE. What I am asking the Senator from Florida is if, as a result of the feedback, it would be better for the economy to have been provided the relief proposed by the House, or whether, as a result of the feedback, it would be better to provide the relief as proposed by the Senate Committee on Finance.

Mr. SMATHERS. The answer is "No," in my judgment. It would not be better to take the House bill with the larger loss.

Mr. HARTKE. The answer cannot be no. Either one proposition or the other has to be correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator asks a question and will not permit me to answer it. The Senator should realize that other Senators have a right to opinions which might be different from his. The Senator asked if I believed it would be desirable to take the House version, and I said no, but now the Senator says I cannot say no. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to be able to say no.

Mr. HARTKE. No what?

Mr. SMATHERS. No to the Senator's question. The answer is "No, I do not favor the House version."

Mr. HARTKE. There will not be a bigger feedback by a greater tax reduction?

Mr. SMATHERS. That is another question, but to that, also, I would say "No."

I think it might serve to add to the general enlightenment of the whole situation if the Senator will permit me to finish my discourse on what the bill is all about, and then the Senator, as I know he will, can get up today, tomorrow, or the next day, if we don't finish before that time, and enlighten us as to what his views are.

I know the Senator's views; I respect him for his views, but I do not agree with him. The Senator must understand that I have that right, but I still have great respect and affection for him. I just happen not to agree with him.

So why does not the Senator from Indiana let me finish making the expression of my views, which happen to coincide with those of the administration on this particular bill, and then he can make an expression of his views, and perhaps at some later date, if we both are still young enough, he might be able to convince me that his position is correct.

Mr. HARTKE. I have great admiration for the Senator from Florida, as he knows, not alone by reason of his fine intellect, but for his ability to be persuasive. But I think the Senate is entitled to one simple proposition, as an answer to my question: What is the effect of this bill going to be upon the budget deficits of 1967 and 1968? I think that is a fair question which I asked the Senator from Florida, and he says he cannot tell me.

Mr. SMATHERS. We have stated here what we think it is going to be, less with the feedback taken into account.

Mr. HARTKE. Yes, but if the feedback is likely to be \$500 million, it makes a lot of difference on how Senators might wish to vote on the matter.

Mr. SMATHERS. If the Senator can tell me how many people in Indiana postponed building plants and purchasing equipment because of the suspension of the 7-percent credit, or how many people, now that we are putting it back on, are going back to building buildings, or buying an airplane, a truck, or an International Harvester tractor, perhaps I can give the Senator the answer to his question.

Mr. HARTKE. I think very few, on both propositions, for the very simple—

Mr. SMATHERS. But the Senator does not know, and I do not know. There is no way of being sure.

Mr. HARTKE. There is certainly as much way to know that as there is to estimate the revenue effect of this bill. I think that knowledge is important to the Senate. It is being asked to vote on a bill when we do not even know what the revenue effect or the feedback effect are going to be. The Secretary of the Treasury does not know; the Director of the Budget does not know.

Mr. SMATHERS. But the Senator from Indiana knows; and I think he should tell us on his own time. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARTKE. No; but I think it is high time that Congress be told by some of these experts what is going to happen in the field of fiscal and monetary affairs. I think it is high time we stop shooting in the dark.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, it may be argued that many of those who made investments during the suspension period had to do so. I ask my fellow Senators to question this assertion carefully. If any taxpayer made an investment during the suspension period as a result of a binding contract entered into before that period, that investment was specifically excluded from the effect of the suspensions. In other words, the suspensions only applied to investments, falling within that 5-month suspension period, over which the taxpayer had substantial discretion. If he went ahead

and made them or committed himself to them, it could only have been because he felt that the advantages of placing an order or beginning construction during that period outweighed the disadvantage of failing to qualify for the investment credit or accelerated depreciation. In other words, if we now give these taxpayers the benefit of the special tax provisions, we will simply be giving most of them a windfall.

The House bill also raises a problem in the way it treats taxpayers who placed orders during the suspension period. Under the House bill, those who received the goods they ordered on or before March 9 would not receive the benefits of these provisions while those who, for one reason or another, received delivery on March 10 or later would get the benefits of the provisions. This result would occur even though both taxpayers placed orders at the same time, while under the impression that the property involved would not qualify for the special provisions.

But, most important in my view, the action taken by the House would also set an unfortunate precedent.

I am afraid it might create, if we were to follow it, a credibility gap with respect to Congress. We have read a great deal about credibility gaps. I do not think that Congress should subject itself to that charge.

Taxpayers would be justified in treating lightly any similar action taken by Congress in the future. I hope that it will not be necessary to take drastic action of this sort again, but I know, as you know, that it could become necessary. If and when it should become necessary to take an action of this sort for economic reasons, it is important that it be effective. Such action would not be effective, however, if most taxpayers ignore it in the expectation that its effect will be repealed retroactively once the crisis has passed. Not only would approval of the House bill make fiscal policy less effective, but it would also impose hardships on taxpayers whose expectations were not fulfilled.

The provisions of the House bill would also be costly in terms of revenue, a result that is inappropriate in view of the large deficit projected for the budgets of this fiscal year and the next. The House amendment to the definition of property that is to be denied the investment credit or the accelerated depreciation would cost the Treasury \$570 million over the fiscal years 1967 through 1970.

For these reasons, our committee deleted the provisions of the House bill which would have altered the definition of property to be denied the special tax provisions provided in the present law. The bill which we enacted last October, still stands in our amendment.

It is not the intention of the committee to permit taxpayers to avoid the effect of the suspensions by simply canceling orders made before March 10 and then promptly reordering the same property. It is contemplated that a reorder under such circumstances will not be treated as a new order if it is substantially the same as the order placed during the suspension period.

THE 50-PERCENT LIMITATION

Our committee made two other changes in the House bill. One of these relates to the increase in the limitation on the amount of investment credit which a taxpayer may claim in any one taxable year. Under the terms of the suspension bill passed last fall, the limitation was to be increased from 25 percent of tax liability in excess of \$25,000 to 50 percent of such liability. The increase was to become effective at the end of the suspension period. Since the House bill did not contain any specific provision relating to this increased limitation, the increase would automatically have gone into effect as of March 10, 1967. The House bill, in other words, would have advanced the date the increase would have become effective. Had the suspension period terminated as provided in present law, the new limitation would have gone into effect on January 1, 1968.

That was what we intended when we approved the suspension of this investment credit last October. I believe that is what most taxpayers expected would be the case, that they would not get this additional limitation raised from 25 to 50 percent until January 1, 1968.

The members of the Finance Committee did not find a compelling reason to advance the date upon which the 50-percent limitation is to become effective. Taxpayers have planned their operations on the assumption that the limitation would not be increased until January 1, 1968. The extension, from 5 years to 7 years, of the period in which unused credits may be carried forward generally insures that any unused credits will not be lost if the new limitation becomes effective as scheduled under present law.

There are, however, sound revenue reasons for not advancing the date of the increased limitation. Such an advance would add to the deficit in the budget projected for this and, in particular, for the coming fiscal year. Together with the deletion of the definitional provisions of the House bill, maintaining the original date for the introduction of the 50-percent limitation will increase revenues by \$775 million as compared to the House bill.

The final change in the House bill approved by your committee is minor. It provides that aircraft registered with the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency and operated under a contract with an agency of the United States will qualify for the investment credit even though operated outside the United States. The amendment permits airlines to claim the investment credit with respect to aircraft operated between Vietnam and other locations in Asia when under contract with the Defense Department.

CONCLUSION

Action on this bill demonstrates once again that Congress can act rapidly when the occasion demands. Were it not for the intervention of the Easter recess, this bill would have been cleared for action by the full Senate less than 3 weeks after the proposal was first announced by the President. Prompt action to approve this bill will give further evidence of Congress willingness to act

expeditiously when appropriate, and, I think, effectively putting a stop to those who continue to recommend that Congress give up some of its rights and allow the executive branch to have stand-by authority to increase or decrease taxes at its particular whim.

This is an authority of Congress given to us by the Constitution. We want to maintain it, and we will maintain it. But, in order to maintain it and maintain it satisfactorily to the people, we have to act expeditiously.

I think we are acting expeditiously in this bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a question has been raised concerning the amount of revenue that would be lost in the event the pending bill were enacted.

Based upon the estimate of the Treasury Department there would be a revenue loss of \$1.085 billion within the bill as reported by the Committee on Finance. There would have been an additional revenue loss of \$1.085 billion in the House bill.

The pending bill reinstates the 7-percent investment credit effective March 9, 1967, rather than waiting until the scheduled restoration date of January 1, 1968. Under the House bill there would be an additional \$1.8 billion revenue loss in the calendar year 1968.

Once the investment credit has been reinstated and is fully operative the annual loss is estimated by the Treasury Department and by our staff to be approximately \$2 billion per year.

(At this point Mr. HOLLINGS assumed the chair.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The restoration effective date of March 9—which means 10 months of calendar year 1967—plus the restoration of the investment tax credit for the full calendar year 1968 represent a tax reduction or loss in revenue of \$3.8 billion.

The question arises: Can we afford to reduce taxes at a time when we are operating with a budget deficit of approximately \$1.5 billion per month? Of course there will be some feedback, but the feedback has been taken into consideration in the estimates of the revenue that will be produced by corporations and by individuals. This is but the first of a three-step tax reduction plan of this administration.

The restoration of the 7-percent investment tax credit—which means a reduction of \$3.8 billion between now and the end of calendar year 1968—is supplemented by a scheduled reduction in the telephone tax from 10 percent to 1 percent effective April 1, 1968. This will mean another \$800 million loss in revenue from that category.

The administration is also planning a third tax reduction step effective April 1, 1968. It proposes to reduce the excise tax on autos from 7 percent to 2 percent. This represents a loss in revenue of \$420 million.

All together the three-stage tax reduction proposal, of which this is but the first step, represents a loss in revenue for calendar years 1967 and 1968 of \$5 billion.

In addition to this \$5 billion being pumped into the economy by the ad-

ministration under this three-stage tax reduction proposal, \$6.150 billion will be pumped into the economy during the same 18-month period under the social security program. The administration is recommending a 20-percent increase in social security benefits, which will cost \$4.100 billion per year. The administration is asking that this increase in benefits be made effective July 1, 1967. This will mean that in the 18-month period from July 1, 1967, to the end of 1968 \$6.150 billion will be pumped into the economy through increased social security benefits.

The tax to pay for these social security benefits under their plan, however, will not become effective until after the 1968 presidential election.

The only tax proposal that the administration has recommend with respect to the social security tax is \$1.8 billion. That \$1.8 billion tax would be effective in calendar year 1968. Under the social security proposal of the administration \$1.8 billion in taxes would be collected in calendar year 1968.

This means that with respect to social security, the administration plans to pump into the economy \$4.350 billion more than would be offset by revenue—or \$6.150 billion in benefits offset by increased taxes in 1968 of \$1.800 billion.

All together by this three-stage tax reduction proposal amounting to \$5 billion plus the increase of social security benefits which is not being financed by an effective tax until after 1969, the administration is planning to pump \$9.350 billion into the economy during the calendar year 1967-68, or prior to the 1968 presidential election. No offsetting revenue is planned or contemplated by the administration.

This is the background with which we approach the pending bill, which is merely a form of tax reduction.

Let us examine the administration's budget position. The administration has estimated that in calendar year 1968 it will have a deficit of \$8.1 billion.

But that estimate is based on the premise that there will be no tax reduction as is now planned in the bill under consideration. When you add that \$1.8 billion loss in revenue, which will result under this bill you increase the fiscal 1968 deficit to \$9.9 billion.

But that projected deficit was based on the premise that Congress was going to enact, effective July 1, 1967, a 6-percent across-the-board tax increase. Every Member of the Senate and the administration knows full well that the moment you approve this tax-reduction program you are not going to reverse that procedure tomorrow and increase taxes. The administration is talking with tongue in cheek. Let us face it—there will be no tax increase effective July 1. That is a foregone conclusion. Therefore, the \$4.7 billion which they had estimated would be received from the 6-percent tax increase in fiscal 1968 will not be available. That brings the deficit up to \$14.6 billion for 1968.

This is the result when we take into consideration the effects of this pending tax reduction proposal and accept the premise that the proposed 6-percent surtax will not be enacted.

However, even this \$14.6 billion does not tell the full story.

The administration is planning to sell our assets in the form of participation sales certificates in an amount of \$5 billion, and to use the proceeds as normal revenue. The plan calls for an accelerated corporate taxpayment of \$800 million and a postal increase of \$700 million. We are now confronted with a deficit in fiscal 1968 of \$21.1 billion. That amount will be reduced by \$1.5 billion only as Congress increases the postal rates and approves further acceleration of the payment of corporate taxes.

Let us tell the American people the truth—using the accounting system that has been used in the 175 years heretofore we are operating this Government today at an annual deficit of around \$20 billion, or more than \$1.5 billion per month. At a time when we are involved in a war in Vietnam, with half a million men fighting over there, at a time when these men are being called upon to make sacrifices, at a time when we have the highest level of employment that this country has ever known, and in the face of a billion and a half dollar monthly deficit, I think it is the height of folly for us to contemplate reducing taxes.

These huge deficits are inviting another round of inflation which will eat up the life savings of many American people.

While I realize the popularity of the pending bill, I shall not support this fiscally irresponsible action which would start a three-stage tax reduction proposal of about \$5 billion that can be financed only on borrowed money.

The Johnson administration has not been operating—and has not made any efforts to operate—within a balanced budget. I estimated the other day that the Johnson administration, beginning with 1964 through its projected 1968 deficits—the 5 years, has spent \$31.742 billion more than it has taken in. This represents the deficits it acknowledges but does not take into consideration its sale of our assets and the use of the proceeds as normal revenue.

In the past 5 years, including its 1968 plans, the administration has sold \$12.304 billion of our assets—participation certificates. The proceeds of these sales should not be counted as a part of general revenue.

Likewise the \$2.4 billion profit that it has picked up by reducing the silver content of coins is nonrecurring income.

When you eliminate these fancy book-keeping gimmicks of the Great Society you find that in the last 5 years the Johnson administration has actually spent \$46.446 billion more than it has taken in, or an average of \$9.3 billion per year; and the rate of deficit for the current fiscal year is running 50 percent higher than it ran in the preceding years.

Under those circumstances there can be no justification for reducing taxes at this time.

This 7-percent investment tax credit is a tax reduction in one sense, but it really should be classified as a subsidy. If enacted, it will mean that the Federal Government will pay for 7 percent of the cost of the new machines, the boxcars,

the office equipment, and other types of equipment which come under this legislation. Seven percent of their cost will be paid out of the Federal Treasury in the form of a tax credit. American business after getting this 7-percent investment tax credit will still depreciate 100 percent of its cost of the equipment. The 7-percent tax credit, representing 7 percent of the cost of the materials, is an extra bonus over and beyond that which they would recover under depreciation. It is mathematically equivalent to allowing them depreciation of 114 percent of the cost of machines.

While I have always favored a more liberal depreciation allowance and while I would like to see our depreciation schedules liberalized, nevertheless I do not believe that under any circumstances a taxpayer should ever be able to depreciate in excess of 100 percent of the cost of the items.

Furthermore, this \$1.8 billion tax reduction does not benefit the American taxpayer as a whole. It does not benefit the American business community as a whole because that type of business which is not prospering under today's circumstances has no need for expansion. Perhaps they do not have customers enough for the plant capacity they already have. They would get no benefit at all because they would not be expanding their plants.

This form of tax reduction would be of benefit only to the more prosperous elements of the business community which would automatically be modernizing their plants. A company which has all that it can do to meet its payroll would get no benefit under this proposal because a tax credit against a loss is zero.

I believe that there are many ways in which the Treasury Department, had it desired, could have helped the American people as well as the business community better, should it have decided it was wise to make a tax reduction.

Mr. President, I return to the original basis of my argument. At a time when everyone admits that we are operating on a deficit rate of around \$1.5 billion monthly, or better than an \$18 billion a year deficit, it is the height of fiscal irresponsibility to be launching a three-stage tax reduction proposal. For that reason I shall not support the bill.

I shall have amendments later which I shall discuss in detail as they are presented. One of the amendments that I shall present is to prevent doubling of the benefits of the 7-percent investment tax credit, compared with the previous law, for certain companies which have not been able to utilize their full 7 percent.

Mr. President, I close my argument at this time by emphasizing that I believe the administration is negligent in its responsibility when it does not recognize that inflation is still a number one threat in this country. The rising cost of living is in evidence in the grocery basket of every American housewife.

When the administration approved this special tax reduction for the business community alone, it is lending encouragement to labor in its wage nego-

tiations with industry later this year. Certainly, this will make it harder for American industry or labor leaders to hold the line.

I believe that this is the time when all American citizens should be willing to tighten our belts, particularly when we consider the casualties and the sacrifices of our men in Vietnam. The very least that those of us who are on the homefront could expect to do is to help pay for some of the cost of this war now rather than to postpone all of the cost until those boys come home.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2536) to terminate the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. HALEY, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. BERRY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

TERMINATION OF INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2536) to terminate the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. FANNIN conferees on the part of the Senate.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the measure before us to restore the 7-percent investment tax credit and accelerated depreciation effective after March 9, 1967, is urgently needed to correct a serious deficiency in our capital recovery tax structure created by the suspension last October.

In retrospect, it seems clear to me that the suspension measure was a mistake. We distorted what was supposed to be a permanent part of our tax system in an effort to control a short-run economic crisis. It was really a belated effort to check inflationary elements and at the same time avoid the political consequences of a general tax increase in an election year.

By the time the administration pro-

posed this device the crisis was already passed and we were heading into a downturn. The suspension merely quickened this trend and brought us in a few short months to our present state. Now the administration asks us to do another about-face and lift the suspension.

As I understand the investment credit and accelerated depreciation, these tax provisions are designed to afford a reasonable recovery for capital outlays in a progressive, dynamic economy. They help to provide the cash flow necessary to bring about a sustained high level of new investment—to modernize American business so that we can produce more at less cost at home and compete more effectively in world markets.

From the beginning the Treasury Department has emphasized to Congress, to business and to the American public that these capital recovery provisions are permanent parts of our tax structure. These statements cannot be reconciled with what the administration has asked Congress to do in the past few months. Sound business planning requires confidence in the permanence and continuity in our tax laws. That confidence has been seriously damaged by what has been said and done in the name of economic controls since last September.

The pending bill encourages the administration to engage in further short-term "tinkering" with the tax laws, such as repeated turning the investment credit off and on, all to the loss of confidence by taxpayers in our tax system.

Turning the investment credit off and on like a spigot has already caused serious criticisms of the tax laws. While the Senate committee report argues that the House bill might dilute the effectiveness of future temporary tax measures, there is a serious question whether the Congress considers such temporary tax measures desirable. If it permits the Senate committee amendments to stand, the administration would be encouraged to believe that such tinkering has congressional encouragement, notwithstanding the burden temporary changes place on the planning of businessmen in a free enterprise system.

These changes encourage those who argue that the function of taxes is not to raise revenue but is to interfere with the normal functioning of the economy. I suggest that Congress should make it clear now that the administration is not being given a blank check to make structural changes in the tax laws.

Coming to our task today, I think there is little or no disagreement that the suspension of these capital recovery tax measures should be ended promptly. The only question is how this is to be done. My choice would be to repeal the suspension law retroactive to its inception last October. That would let business know most forcefully that the suspension was an exceptional and unfortunate experiment not to be repeated. There could be no valid claim of any discrimination in treatment under such retroactive repeal. There would be no administrative complications.

The Finance Committee, in its wisdom, has reported out a much less effective bill. It is prospective only, from

March 9. Any order placed or construction started before that date means that the property, as a whole, is disqualified from any tax credit or, in the case of buildings, full accelerated depreciation. This is true even if the property is not delivered or put into service until weeks, months or even years after the March 9 restoration date. The measure passed by the House, in contrast, would have provided the normal credit and accelerated depreciation for deliveries or construction after the restoration date.

As passed by the House this bill would have restored the availability of the 7-percent investment tax credit for all qualified property acquired after March 9, 1967. The Senate Finance Committee amendments would eliminate the availability of the credit if the property was ordered during the 5-month suspension period, between October 10, 1966, and March 9, 1967, even if acquired long after March 9, 1967.

For example, an airplane acquired in 1969 would not be eligible for the credit if ordered March 1, 1967. This change would create major problems of administration of the revenue laws, for both taxpayers and the Internal Revenue Service, especially with regard to long leadtime property. It would cause serious disruptions in normal dealings between purchasers and their suppliers. It would discriminate unfairly between taxpayers who acquire identical items at the same time, based on when the property was ordered. It encourages the administration to engage in further short-term "tinkering" with the tax laws, such as repeated turning the investment credit off and on, all to the loss of confidence by taxpayers in our tax system.

There is little question in my mind as to the reason for the Finance Committee's action. The administration, contrary to everything they had been saying for the last 6 months, suddenly turned the suspension law into a tax raising measure. The Secretary of the Treasury pleaded with the committee, at the very last minute, not to make the restoration retroactive in any degree in order to conserve the revenues.

It was made to appear to the committee that by supporting retroactive repeal or even the halfway measures in the House-passed bill, we would be making a tax handout to business. How could this be justified when the administration was proposing a 6-percent tax hike for the Nation generally later in the year?

The superficial appeal of these arguments swung the committee, under pressure to report the measure the very same day, to adopt the administration amendments.

This revenue argument was deception and misleading. Actually, all that the House-passed bill did was to restore the tax structure to what existed before the extraordinary suspension.

How could this be a selective tax reduction for business if, as the administration repeats, time and time again, last September and October, the suspension law was not a discriminatory tax increase against business? Actually, the only grain of truth in the revenue argument was that the House-passed bill did

accelerate the time at which the new 50 percent of tax limitation on the credit went into effect. I can appreciate the logic of the Finance Committee amendment setting that change back to the original December 31, 1967, date as it was a new structural adjustment.

The committee's other amendment bringing back the stringent "order" and "start of construction" tests of the suspension law was, in my opinion, a very serious error. It was the product of haste.

The committee did not have any real opportunity to consider and evaluate the practical consequences of its action. No business witnesses were permitted to testify. Because the shift in position was almost totally unexpected and contrary to every report, the case in support of the version passed by the House was never really heard.

Mr. President, during the recess just concluded, I have conferred with several members of the House Ways and Means Committee and they have explained to me the very real, practical considerations which led the Ways and Means Committee to adopt its version of H.R. 6950. I have heard from many businessmen from all over the Nation. I have learned from them the seriousness of these problems.

I have no doubt if the Finance Committee version becomes law we will find that there will be the greatest wave of order cancellations that has ever been seen in the capital goods industries, all stimulated by the prospect of a 7-percent discount.

We will find that the orders will be cancelled and replaced. The more sophisticated buyers will vary the terms or the delivery dates. In some cases orders will be switched from one supplier to another. There will be gross and artificial distortions in deliveries and production schedules.

The Treasury will not be able to control this situation. Regulations have not been written and time will not permit them to be developed and promulgated in such a short time. Everyone will have his own idea as to how to get the 7-percent credit.

The bill would provide a 7-percent tax credit for one concern which obtains property long after the suspension period, for example on January 1, 1969, and denies it to his competitor who receives an identical article on the same day, merely because the latter placed his order on March 9, 1967, while the former waited 1 day, until March 10. The competitive disadvantage created between these two concerns is unwarranted, particularly when, as is often the case, there was little economic leeway when it came to choosing the date to place the order.

It will be a free-for-all on the grandest scale. Then the Treasury will come along years later and try to assess taxes on some. There will be disagreements. There will be misunderstandings. There will be litigation.

This is not my concept of orderly and fair tax administration. In the long run it will cost us far more in terms of the effectiveness of our voluntary self-assessment system and tax administra-

tion costs than any immediate revenue saving from a tough restoration measure. It is a shortsighted solution.

Mr. President, on page 86 of the printed record of the hearings held by the Finance Committee on H.R. 6950 appears a letter by the Secretary of the Treasury to our colleague, the junior Senator from Florida, concerning certain fiscal aspects of the legislation now before us. For the purposes of this record, I would like to comment on the Secretary's letter.

In acting on H.R. 6950, the Senate Finance Committee approved a version of the bill that was more stringent than the House bill in two major respects as follows: First, the House-passed bill would restore the investment credit effective March 9, 1967, in the case of section 38 property ordered or acquired after the termination of the suspension period. The Senate-reported bill would deny the credit to property ordered during the suspension period even though acquired thereafter. Second, the House-passed version retained existing law in making the 50-percent limitation effective with the termination of the suspension whereas the Senate-reported version would defer this liberalization until January 1, 1968.

The second paragraph of Secretary Fowler's letter refers to a need to protect the revenues. It should be recognized that according to the Treasury Department's own statements, neither the suspension nor the restoration of the credit was advocated for revenue purposes; H.R. 6950 is not a proposal designed to raise or lower tax revenues. The purpose of the bill is to restore a tax incentive for investment. The credit has repeatedly been described by Treasury spokesmen as being a permanent part of our Federal tax structure. At the time the investment credit was first enacted in 1962, its adoption was attended by the approval of other revenue-raising tax changes that continue in effect. Therefore, it can be argued that the credit has already been "paid for" by the business community through the concurrent adoption by the Congress of more stringent tax changes that tended to offset the revenue loss resulting from the credit.

It is submitted that the suspension of the investment credit has served its purpose; namely, to relieve the economic pressures from the boom in capital investment. The restoration of the credit should be prompt and complete to assure a resumption of economic growth and to preserve faith with the American taxpayers.

The seriousness of the budgetary situation cannot be gainsaid. However, the acknowledged fact that the credit suspension was not a revenue measure strongly suggests that its restoration should not be conditioned on revenue considerations. Indeed, if the downward trend suggested by current economic indicators is not reversed in the immediate months ahead, an even more serious budgetary situation may develop from declining revenues resulting from a dip in the national income figures. It is also to be recognized that the business community in recent months has been called

upon by the Treasury to assume billions of dollars in accelerated tax liabilities through earlier payments of tax obligations. This acceleration of tax liability has seriously affected the cash flow position of the business community and this condition should not be further aggravated by a prolonged, piecemeal restoration of the credit. It is pointed out that the version of the bill now before the Senate is even more stringent than the original administration proposal for restoration of the credit in that the 50-percent limitation would be deferred until January 1, 1968, instead of at the end of the suspension period. The credit should be fully restored promptly. Anything less than prompt and complete restoration would provide a Treasury windfall.

In the last paragraph of the Secretary's letter, there is an enumeration of recourses that may be necessary if a stringent approach to restoration of the credit is not adopted. These enumerated recourses include resort to higher debt or higher income taxes. It is submitted there is another alternative—lower spending.

Mr. President, out of respect for the Finance Committee and because of the urgency of action on the restoration measure, I am not proposing at this time to amend the version of H.R. 6950 now before us. I will cast my vote in favor of this measure because I believe that the overriding consideration is the prompt restoration of the tax credit and normal depreciation as permanent and rightful parts of our tax structure.

In so voting, however, and I believe I speak for many of my colleagues, I do not express my approval for the amendments of the Finance Committee which would deny these normal tax provisions to those who ordered or started construction of property before March 9. I favor the House-passed version in this respect and I am hopeful that this result may be achieved when the measure goes to conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that the clerk read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following: "Sec. 5. Section 303(c) (2) (B) of the Presidential Election Campaign Act of 1966 is amended by striking out '5,000,000' at each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '2,000,000'."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Delaware and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the language proposed by the Senator from Delaware, the Senator from Tennessee proposes to insert the following:

Sec. 5. (a) The Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966 is repealed.

(b) (1) Subchapter A of chapter 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out part VIII (relating to designa-

tion of income tax payments to presidential election campaign fund).

(2) The table of parts for such subchapter is amended by striking out the item relating to part VIII.

(3) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to income tax liability for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To clarify the record, does the Senator from Tennessee offer his amendment to the bill or to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. GORE. It is by way of a substitute for the amendment of the senior Senator from Delaware, and I offer it on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I shall support the substitute proposal and join the Senator from Tennessee in urging its adoption. This substitute, of which I am a cosponsor, would repeal this law. I think it should be repealed. I yield back to the Senator from Tennessee, but I want the record clear that I am supporting the substitute proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, on the last day of the 89th Congress the Senate approved the conference report on H.R. 13103 and then sent to the President what was aptly labeled the Christmas tree bill. Those who were the authors of that label felt that legislation providing so many goodies to so many special interests at the expense of the general public should be associated with the traditional concept of giving as the Christmas holiday season approached.

H.R. 13103 as it came to the Senate was a good bill. It sought, by modifying the incidence of taxes on income from foreign-owned investments in the United States, to encourage such investments, thereby improving the critical balance-of-payments problems facing the United States. The Senate Finance Committee and later the Senate itself added so many unwise and unsound amendments that what had been a good bill was transformed into a monstrosity. Only slightly modified in conference, the bad in the bill so far outweighed the good that I hoped that the Senate, upon reflection, would reject it. This proved to be a futile hope in the adjournment rush. By a vote of 31-22 the Senate approved the Christmas tree bill and so, subsequently, did President Johnson.

Title III of the bill, now title III of Public Law 89-809, is known as the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966. This law is unsound in its approach. It is of doubtful constitutionality. It is so loosely drawn that efforts to put it into operation would be an administrative nightmare. Its effect would be uncertain. If it becomes operative it will compound the evils that now flow from loose and questionable campaign financing practices. Unless this law is repealed, it will likely doom future efforts to reform our utterly unrealistic law relating to the use of money in Federal elections.

The amendment now before the Senate would repeal title III. I urge the

Senate to consider this matter anew, in the light of what this law actually provides, and in the absence of the distractions of an understandable desire for adjournment which prevailed on October 22 of last year.

Mr. President, Congress has made a mistake. The proper course is to erase that mistake and start anew.

Mr. President, we have been talking for decades about the need to correct the unsavory aspects of money in elections. But we have done absolutely nothing. Bill after bill has been introduced. Upon occasion within the last 10 years, bills providing marginal reform have actually passed the Senate, but no bill has been enacted into law, except this very unwise one that makes a bad situation worse. Congress has acted somewhat like the procrastinating homeowner who does not fix the leaky roof when it is raining because it is too wet to work, or in fair weather because there is no apparent immediate need. It is difficult to generate public enthusiasm for election law reform in a nonelection year, and there is a reluctance to change the rules during a year in which an election is in progress.

There is nothing evil *per se* in the use of money in election campaigns. Indeed, expenditure is an indispensable element if the electorate is to be properly informed about the views of the candidates on the issues. In our modern society, as issues become more complex and as the use of television and other mass communications media becomes more crucial, there is legitimate need for campaign funds in increasing amounts. The evil which threatens our democratic election process arises from the use of funds in excessive amounts, from the use of funds obtained from questionable sources—or in a questionable amount from a source otherwise legitimate—from the use of funds for improper purposes, and from a lack of public disclosure of the amounts actually expended, the purposes for which they were spent, and the sources from which they were obtained.

Existing law on this subject is completely unrealistic and ineffective. The limits which existing law purports to place on campaign contributions and expenditures are so universally disregarded and so easily avoided as to breed contempt for law generally. I do not believe this point needs further elaboration, particularly to Members of the U.S. Senate.

If the Presidential Campaign Fund Act of 1966 really attacked the deficiencies of existing law or even made a start in that direction it would merit consideration. But it does not. It makes matters much worse. The act authorizes a Federal subsidy in an amount estimated at \$60 million to be divided equally between the two major political parties for unrestricted use by them, in addition to what other amounts they can otherwise raise, from whatever sources and in whatever manner, thus commingling taxpayers' funds with private political contributions from whatever source, for whatever purpose, however questionable. It has been suggested by proponents of

the law passed last year that the availability of this subsidy will bring an end to political fund-raising activities at the national level. Mr. President, we now have this law. Unfortunately, though this is the law, it seems that the price of a ticket at fund-raising dinners for the Democratic Party has increased from \$100 to \$250; and I believe Senators on the other side are having to contribute \$500 for a plate of food at a fund-raising dinner. So the appetite seems to have been whetted rather than dulled. I suggest that those who believe this law will end political fund raising should take another look at the detailed provisions of the act and perhaps make a more realistic analysis of current practices in the raising and spending of campaign money.

Let us examine the provisions of this law. It provides that, beginning with taxable years starting after December 31, 1966, any taxpayer may, by checking an appropriate box on his tax return, elect to have \$1 of his tax payment transferred to a special fund to be used to pay expenses of presidential campaigns. This is no longer the taxpayer's money. The tax liability is something he owes the Government. When the payment is made, it is made to the Government. It belongs to the U.S. Treasury. This law would permit the taxpayer, rather than Congress, to appropriate that money—to determine what shall be done with it.

This unique procedure is one which has never been followed before. True, Congress has in the past levied taxes and then provided that the revenue from that tax or a portion of it would be earmarked for a special purpose. Today, for example, revenue from certain highway-user taxes is earmarked for highway construction. But it is Congress that earmarks the revenue or a portion thereof. So far as I can ascertain the law passed last year, which I now seek to repeal, is the first time the Congress has ever undertaken to authorize the individual taxpayer to decide on a year-to-year basis the purpose for which a portion of the money he pays in taxes shall be used. If it is a sound practice for the taxpayer to say for what it shall be used, it would be equally sound for him to say for what it shall not be used; and to the extent that a taxpayer directs that tax funds shall be used for a particular purpose, he automatically thereby says it shall not be used for other purposes.

In my opinion, the earmarking of tax revenue in any form is unwise. To the extent that revenue is earmarked for special purposes, the ability of Congress to control expenditures by the appropriations process is diminished. Under the earmarking procedure some programs may be overfunded and others starved for funds, with the legislative body powerless to take corrective action through the appropriations process. But the precedent established by title III of Public Law 89-809 is potentially even more dangerous. If we start down the road of allowing each individual taxpayer to decide for what purpose his tax funds may or may not be spent, we may well find that Congress has abdicated its con-

stitutional responsibility of making appropriation of public funds. If a taxpayer has that right, if it is constitutional and if this precedent should be followed, perhaps there are taxpayers who would like an opportunity to decide whether their tax money shall be spent or not be spent for the war in Vietnam, or a war on poverty, or education, or public works projects, or agriculture programs, or urban redevelopment, or support for agricultural commodities such as milk. Where do we stop with this process? Is this a wise precedent? We have made a mistake, Mr. President. Let us erase that mistake, and the quicker the better.

The quicker the better, because soon the tax forms, which we have sought to simplify over the years, will go to the Public Printer. Does the Senate think this box will be popular with our constituents? I am not sure. Perhaps taxpayers would like to have a referendum upon a number of public programs and policies. Perhaps they would like the privilege of deciding what portion of their funds should be used for a National Labor Relations Board, or for the Maritime Commission, for instance. If it is constitutional in one instance, if it is sound precedent for one program, then why not give to taxpayers, the same authority with respect to other programs.

This is a bizarre procedure, one never before attempted under the Constitution of the United States. I think it raises serious questions.

There are also serious constitutional questions about the formula used in the statute to identify the presidential candidates who would be eligible to benefit from the subsidy. In practical effect, only the candidates of the two major political parties will share the benefits. All other candidates for President will be excluded. This is accomplished by the simple device of authorizing payments from the subsidy fund only to those political parties whose candidates for President received a minimum of 5 million votes in the preceding presidential election.

Mr. President, what candidate for President received 5 million votes in 1964 other than the nominees of the Democratic and Republican Parties? There were none. There never have been any in the history of our Republic. And yet it may well be that some American citizen will aspire to the presidency of his country through the medium of another political party.

Shall we say that only President Johnson, who I assume will be the Democratic nominee, and—whom shall I say; any suggestions?—Richard Nixon, Governor Romney, Governor Rockefeller, Senator CARLSON, or whoever may be the nominee of the Republican Party shall have their campaigns handsomely financed out of the Public Treasury to an estimated amount of \$30 million each?

There might be a Bull Moose movement in the Republican Party. I think it would do it good.

Now and then we have had a few Democrats who disagreed with their party. Should the nominee of the Liberal Party with membership in New

York State and, perhaps in several other States, be denied a share of the public campaign subsidy?

Suppose that ex-Governor Wallace or Governor Wallace decides to run for President. Suppose there is another Teddy Roosevelt, another Bob La Follette, or another Burton K. Wheeler. Shall we say in the U.S. Senate—as we have provided by law—that his campaign shall be penniless as far as the public Treasury is concerned, but that the nominees of the Democratic and Republican Parties shall be handsomely financed from the public till? That is what Congress has said. We made a mistake, Mr. President. Let us erase that mistake.

In the Nation's history no third-party presidential candidate ever received as many as 5 million votes. No splinter party candidate approached anything like that total in the election of 1964. Thus the Republican and Democratic parties would have the exclusive right to share in the subsidy to pay expenses of the 1968 presidential election.

Any program to provide Federal financial assistance for use in election campaigns must necessarily contain some formula for distinguishing between bona fide candidates and those entering the lists only for the purpose of obtaining access to Federal funds. Reasonable provisions to limit benefits to bona fide candidates would, in my opinion, satisfy the constitutional requirement of the first amendment.

But the reasonableness of the cutoff point contained in the formula of the act is, to say the least, open to question. Not only must a political party demonstrate its public support to the tune of 5 million votes, but it must also have done so retroactively by having fielded a candidate who received that many votes in an election held 4 years previously.

In 1968, for example, even though a third party presidential candidate should command widespread public support, such a candidate and his party could not possibly qualify for Federal subsidy. Conceivably there might be a third-party candidate who, with access to public funds equal to that of the major party candidates, might receive more votes than either of his opponents; yet such a candidate and his party would not receive 1 cent of Federal funds while his major party opponents would each receive up to \$30 million of public money.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending substitute.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I do not wish to be misunderstood as advocating dissolution of our two-party system. In my view, our two-party political structure is one of the basic strengths of our form of government. I am not here suggesting that we should encourage the development of splinter parties, third parties, or fourth parties by subsidy or otherwise. That is not the point at all. Rather it is my view that we cannot, without doing violence to the Constitution, impede the development or the

success of a third political party by subsidizing the two existing major parties under eligibility rules so grossly unfair as to be arbitrary and unreasonable. And even if we could do so, would it be wise to so freeze the mobility of our political system?

After all, one of the two major political parties of today emerged from a breakdown of another party. Should we make sure this can never happen again?

Would it be in the public interest to provide in this indirect way that it could never happen again?

Is it wise to make our system so rigid that a conservative movement, a liberal movement, or any other kind of movement cannot survive and compete in the political arena?

I think even if we could constitutionally do so it would be unfair and unwise to do so.

The requirement that eligibility to participate in this bonanza must have been established retroactively 4 years before the election in connection with which benefits are sought seems to me clearly unreasonable. Although we have had a number of perennial fringe splinter parties, none has ever come close to meeting the 5-million-vote test.

Is political aspiration not a civil right? Is the opportunity to compete for political preferment, for political office on equal terms, with equal opportunity, not a civil right?

It is a right as basic as the privilege of voting, and yet this unwise law seeks to circumscribe that right. We have by law circumscribed the right of equal opportunity to seek public office, to seek the Presidency of the United States. We have limited it to two men—the nominee of the Democratic Party and the nominee of the Republican Party. We have made a mistake, Mr. President. Let us erase that mistake.

If the major parties are subsidized while the minority parties are not, they will be even less likely to meet the 5 million vote test in the future. In our political history third party movements which attract support in any substantial degree arise out of issues of the day or around an individual personality, as in the case of the Bull Moose revolt of Theodore Roosevelt and the rally of the Progressives around Robert La Follette. The text of title III of Public Law 89-809 as it was enacted was obviously designed to make certain that no such movement in the future would be encouraged to survive one battle to fight again 4 years later. As the bill first passed the Senate, the vote test was set at 1½ million votes. This was increased by the conference committee to 5 million votes in order, so it is rumored, to make it practically certain that only the Republican and the Democratic Parties would ever receive benefits from the subsidy authorized by the bill.

Again, it is not a question of what may be considered desirable or undesirable. It is a question of what is fair and reasonable—not only to Republicans and Democrats but also to those who prefer some other party to either. I do not engage in the pastime of predicting what the Supreme Court would do in a given

situation. I have found the Court a bit unpredictable at times. There are formidable legal obstacles to getting the matter before the Court. But if the constitutional concept of one man, one vote is to have practical validity, the constitutional questions raised by the act passed last year cannot be swept under the rug of expediency.

I pass now, Mr. President, from the approach followed by the act to comment on some of its provisions. To begin with, this law is utterly lacking in clarity. A careful reading of its text raises many questions for which no answers are to be found either in the statute or in its legislative history.

First, who is to receive the money? The law directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay "into the treasury of each political party" which qualifies. But the "treasury" of a political party is not otherwise defined or identified. For that matter, our two major political parties do not have corporate form, nor are they otherwise legal entities. There is a Democratic National Committee and a Republican National Committee, and each of these has a treasurer. But is there in fact an actual Democratic National Party and a Republican National Party—or a National Republican Party—that have been organized and have officers? As I have said, there is a Republican National Committee and a Democratic National Committee, with a chairman, with a treasurer, and so forth. But is there a Republican National Party, with a chairman and with a treasurer? If so, I yield for some Senator to name the chairman, name the treasurer. I know of no such legal entity with a Democratic identification. I know of no such legal entity with a Republican identification. I know of no treasurer of such a legal entity. Yet, the law directs that the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay "into the treasury of each political party" which qualifies.

It is in this cavalier way that this law would deal with an estimated \$60 million of public funds.

Under previously existing law, neither of the national committees is permitted to receive or disburse more than \$3 million in a calendar year. So if we assume by implication, by some writing of regulation, some obtuse interpretation, that the Secretary of the Treasury can pay \$30 million to the treasurer of the Democratic National Committee or of the Republican National Committee, what do we do with the law that limits those committees to \$3 million per year? Is it intended that this \$3 million limit is repealed by implication, or is it intended that the treasurers of the other committees formed to promote the candidacy of the presidential candidates of the major parties shall also constitute the "treasury" of that political party? I do not know; the statute does not say.

We have made a mistake, Mr. President. Let us erase it. The law does not identify either by name or by title the individuals to whom payment is to be made. Perhaps the term "treasury of each political party" was intended to be somewhat flexible. If that be so, the language used was magnificently successful. The language used is sufficiently

vague to satisfy almost any test of flexibility.

There is apparent confusion in the minds of some about whether a qualifying political party must pay from its own funds a portion of its expenses and be entitled to reimbursement only for expenses in excess of \$5 million. A committee print distributed by the Senate Finance Committee subsequent to enactment of Public Law 89-809 states:

First, all parties are to be subject to a \$5 million floor, for which no reimbursement is to be allowed.

This committee document implies that qualifying parties must pay from other sources the first \$5 million of campaign expenses. But I do not find that the statute reads in this way.

Section 303(c) (2) (A) provides that the total amount that a major political party may receive is limited to "the excess over \$5 million" of one-half of \$1 multiplied by the total vote cast for candidates of the two major parties. For example, since 70 million votes were cast in the 1964 presidential election, each of the major parties would be entitled to reimbursement in 1968 for its expenses up to a maximum of one-half of \$70 million, less \$5 million, or \$30 million. There is no provision whatever that requires that even the first \$1 of expenses be paid from privately raised funds. Qualifying parties may seek reimbursement for each and every dollar of expenses incurred "with respect to" each presidential campaign up to the maximum, which, as indicated above, will be about \$30 million in 1968.

Section 303(c) (2) (C) states that:

No payment with respect to any Presidential campaign shall be made before September 1 of the year of the Presidential election with respect to which such campaign is conducted.

While this provision directs that "payment" to political parties cannot be made before September 1, it does nothing to limit such payments to reimbursement for expenses incurred after that date. Apparently, payment may be made after September 1 for expenses incurred before September 1. The only requirement, timewise, is that the "treasurer of such party" must certify that the amount requested has been "spent or incurred" prior to the date of certification, "with respect to" the presidential campaign. Thus, if a political party has funds otherwise available, or credit, the September 1 deadline is of no significance whatever.

Under the terms of the statute the field is wide open not only as to the timing but also as to the purpose and the place of expenditures eligible for reimbursement from public funds. Under the heading of "Limitations" the only requirement is that the treasurer of the party must certify that the amount requested was "spent or incurred in carrying on such presidential campaign" prior to the request for reimbursement, plus the added limitation that a party may not be reimbursed in a total amount which exceeds the total amount it has spent.

This raises all sorts of interesting possibilities. If obligations are incurred by a State party organization "with respect to" the presidential campaign but paid

by the national organization, may reimbursement be made for such expenses? It would appear so, though this is not entirely clear. In fact, there are many things in this law not entirely clear. It may not even be necessary to decide this point if the treasurer of the State committee is deemed to be part of the "treasury" of the political party.

How can it be said which treasurer of which committee is the treasurer of the Democratic National Party, or the Republican National Party, or how many treasurers there may be? The law is silent on this point.

There is no apparent prohibition against a party financing its entire operation by loans during the first 9 months of the election year and then paying off the loans after September 1 with Federal funds. Is there anyone to gainsay that? The act does not prohibit it.

Perhaps a national committee may become dissatisfied with the personnel directing its party's affairs in a State—or for that matter in all 50 States. It might simply enlarge its own staff by employing field representatives to be stationed in the several States and having their salaries and expenses paid from Federal funds. In such a situation where is the voice of the State committee in the conduct of the campaign? Even at today's prices \$30 million will go a long way and particularly if spent in a few pivotal States, or in a few States, pivotal or not pivotal; for instance, in a State in which one party or the other might wish to make an intensive effort to defeat or elect a Senator or a Member of Congress.

So far as the provisions of title III of Public Law 89-809 are concerned either major party could spend its entire \$30 million in a few States, or even in one State. If nothing else gives Senators and Congressmen cause for concern, this should. The subsidy provided by this act could be used to thwart the will of the people of a particular State to select a representative of their choosing without undue influence from without. Mr. President, we have made a mistake. Let us erase it.

Almost any conceivable type of expenditure could be held to have been incurred "with respect to" a presidential campaign or "in carrying on" a presidential campaign. In theory, the funds authorized by the act are limited to the payment of expenses of the presidential campaign, with nothing provided to defray the expenses of congressional or senatorial campaigns in which the party may also have candidates. But what are campaign expenditures? They are nowhere defined.

Given the way our political campaigns are conducted, how are the campaigns to be separated by candidates? How is the campaign for President to be kept separate from the campaign for the Senate, Congress, or Governor.

The Senate Finance Committee in its report on the bill states as follows:

To preclude any of the presidential election campaign fund from being used for other than the campaign expenses of candidates for President and Vice President, no reimbursement will be made for any item related to a candidate for any office other than President or Vice President. For ex-

ample, if a Presidential or Vice Presidential candidate should make a joint political appearance with a candidate for another public office and a substantial purpose of the Presidential or Vice Presidential appearance is to further the candidacy of the other candidate, no reimbursement for such joint appearance will be allowed.

Unfortunately, the committee's view, as above quoted, is not spelled out in the statute nor, in my opinion, supported by the statute. The text of the statute contains no such restrictions or limitation. Upon close analysis the committee report language itself is somewhat less than clear. If a presidential candidate in a nationwide TV address, after spelling out his own views on the issues and detailing the virtues of his party should suggest that the electorate ought to send to Washington a majority of Congressmen of the same political persuasion, does this disqualify the expenses of that telecast for reimbursement? I doubt anyone could answer that question with certainty. Will it be necessary for candidates for the Senate, the House of Representatives, or for Governor to flee the area when their party's presidential candidate comes to their State, lest the expenses of the presidential candidate's trip be subjected to doubt. Must, or can, a presidential candidate run in a vacuum, disassociating himself from other candidates of his party? Where are the guidelines to determine what expenses are eligible for reimbursement? There are no guidelines at all in the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966.

There are no safeguards against corrupt practices. There are no safeguards against misappropriations. There are no safeguards against the use of funds for purposes of usurpation of public will rather than implementation of public will. We made a mistake in many respects. Let us erase that mistake.

If the provisions of this act are to be administered at all, then those who write the regulations must, in effect, write the law. The law does not provide the guidelines for the use of this political slush fund. Therefore, if it is to be administered at all a guideline must be provided by regulation. I wonder if my Republican colleagues are agreeable to a Democratic administration writing the rules governing who can spend how much and for what in the 1968 campaign. It would seem to me that no political party out of power would willingly entrust this responsibility to the party in power. If title III of Public Law 89-809 remains on the statute books this will be the result, if we are to have any rules at all by which this slush fund is to be expended.

The proponents of the act argue that the subsidy it authorizes will free presidential campaigns of the need for tainted money. In addition to helping presidential candidates, this is supposed to be helpful to candidates for the Senate and the House since, it is suggested, private contributions will then be more readily available for their use.

Theoretically, there is apparent logic in this contention. But the fact is that the act imposes no limitations whatever upon the raising and spending of private funds in behalf of presidential candi-

dates or any other candidates. National fundraising drives can continue as before and the proceeds can be spent as they have been spent in the past. Thereafter—on or after September 1—the party may claim reimbursement for the expenses which it has already paid with private contributions, thus ending the election year with a profit sufficient to sustain the party organization handsomely for the ensuing 3 years until the next presidential election year—and until the next distribution of public funds. In the alternative, private funds raised by a party at the national level could be expended in behalf of those congressional candidates selected for favor by the national party organization, or even in an election for mayor or sheriff.

Mr. President, I am appalled that a majority of both the Senate and House should have approved a measure so utterly devoid of safeguards. But a majority did approve it, and so did the President. As I said earlier, what we have done is to provide \$60 million in Federal funds to be divided between the Republican and Democratic parties, with the parties free to spend it as they see fit in addition to what they can raise otherwise, thus compounding the unsavory aspects of political campaign financing.

Sponsors of this act have apparently recognized some of its defects and various amendments are already being suggested.

Mr. President, my distinguished friend, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], has made several public statements with respect to proposed amendments. I should like to say at this point that since he is not in the Chamber today, I have suggested and requested the Democratic leadership to postpone a vote upon my amendment until tomorrow. I think that is the agreed-on order of business.

But amendments limited to the scope and the framework of last year's act, though they might make it administratively workable, could not make it a good law.

It will be interesting to see the recommendation of the special study group appointed by the President for the purpose of making a study of this law and making recommendations. There are rumors that the committee has suggested its repeal.

I suggest its repeal.

We shall have a vote on that.

For a law so unsound in its approach and so lacking in safeguards, the only effective remedy is repeal.

Mr. President, as I said earlier in these remarks, the subject of Federal law relating to campaign contributions and expenditures has been much discussed in the past 10 years. There is an urgent need for a comprehensive, realistic law effectively regulating the use of money in elections. The need for clean election legislation is endorsed, on paper at least, by many persons, both in Congress and in the public generally.

In 1956, a comprehensive bill was introduced in the Senate. Its principal sponsors were then Majority Leader Johnson and the minority leader, Senator Knowland. Altogether, 86 Senators—the total number of Senators was then 96—signed the bill as cosponsors. Never before had conditions for clean

election legislation seemed more propitious.

Eighty-six of ninety-six Senators had signed the bill but it never had enough support to be reported from a committee.

An incident had occurred which had aroused the Nation to the need for reform and which, it appeared, would serve as a catalyst to spur action by Congress.

A U.S. Senator, the late Francis Case of South Dakota, revealed on the floor of the Senate that he had been offered a bribe in the form of a campaign contribution in return for his vote in favor of the natural gas bill. President Eisenhower vetoed the bill, primarily, according to his veto message, because he felt that passage of the bill was tainted.

Thus, amid widespread expressions of righteous indignation, 86 Senators cosponsored a bill to do something about the problem.

But as I have said, that bill was not even reported by the committee to which it was referred; nor was either of several other comprehensive bills introduced during the same session of Congress, including one introduced by the then junior Senator from Tennessee.

In 1956, there were two Senate committee investigations, much oratory, and no action.

Since then, we have had a Presidential commission on the subject which submitted recommendations that went unheeded by the Congress. As Public Law 89-809 was approved on the last day of the 89th Congress, a bill embodying President Johnson's recommendations was languishing in committee and a less comprehensive bill died on the Senate calendar.

Mr. President, it is obvious that something more than a catalyst is needed if we are to achieve genuine election law reform. There is a fear on the part of many that effective limitations on contributions and expenditures will deprive candidates of funds with which to meet legitimate campaign expenses. This accounts in part for reluctance to vote for effective controls.

And so, I have concluded that in order to enact legislation which would effectively eliminate questionable campaign-financing practices, it may be necessary to provide some alternate source of campaign funds. I believe that this view is shared by many who are interested in reform.

A bill providing for Federal participation in campaign financing under proper safeguards, and also effectively limiting private contributions and the expenditure thereof might, it seems to me, be passed. This is the carrot-and-the-stick formula. After more than 10 years of active interest and effort to promote campaign financing legislation, I have concluded that such an approach has merit, and it may be the only approach which will lead to the enactment of genuine reform legislation.

In passing the Presidential Campaign Fund Act of 1966, we gave up the carrot without any reform at all. Without this carrot, reform will continue to elude us.

There is still time to repair the damage. The act will not become operative until 1967 tax returns are filed in 1968. But unless this unsound law is repealed

before the Secretary of the Treasury starts writing checks in 1968, we shall have lost any realistic chance to do anything about the loose practices which now prevail under existing law.

For the foregoing reasons I urge the Senate to reverse the unwise action which was taken in haste last October. The first step is the repeal of the unsound measure which was passed. When this has been accomplished, the Congress should proceed to consider seriously the suggestions submitted by President Johnson, the late President Kennedy, and others, and enact an effective law which will eliminate improper and excessive influence of money in Federal election campaigns.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. 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. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

A BALANCED TAX STRUCTURE FOR A BALANCED ECONOMY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate today has as its stated primary purpose, according to the position taken by the administration, the return to normal growth in the economy as it is affected by capital investment. The statement was continually made throughout testimony before both the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Finance Committee that the so-called instability engendered by unsustainable growth has been brought to a state of equilibrium by this supposedly judicious and well-timed suspension of the investment tax credit. The suspension of October 10 has been declared partially responsible for the alleged return to economic elysium after a wild ride characterized by unbridled growth of productive capacity, employment, personal and corporate income, unparalleled Treasury revenues, and the never-before-seen phenomenon of a country fighting a major war 9,000 miles from its shores and at the same time sustaining growth in consumer sectors of the economy during free market conditions.

Mr. President, I have tried very sincerely and studiously to see just what is wrong with the conditions that I have described. In light of natural adjustments in the economy roughly a full quarter before the suspension of the tax credit, I dismiss the words "unbridled" or "unsustainable" as being characteristic of economic theorists who see just how untimely and unnecessary the application of any fiscal restraint was at this time. For anyone to have claimed to foresee the conditions existing in the last two quarters of calendar 1967 and used that at a basis for this mismeasure, particularly when the best economic talent in the country still cannot make them out, is imprudent, to say the least. And judging from comparisons between projected figures both in absolute figures

and in growth rates and those tabulated for the last 3 months, leadtime for administration clairvoyance has been reduced considerably, in fact, if not in its own mind.

A look at economic indicators of the second and third quarters of 1966 make abundantly clear, Mr. President, that the economy was not overheating. It was, of its own accord, leveling off. It is as if it could foresee, unless it minded its manners and grew at a rate that was considered "safe" it would be subjected to fiscal and economic restraints and other things, "too terrible to mention."

A glance at some of the more obvious indicators makes this quite clear. According to the Federal Reserve index points, industrial production was beginning to level off as early as July of 1966. Surely this was sufficiently early in the game to be taken into account in any decision to suspend the investment incentive. Manufacturers' capital appropriations were recovering from a significant decline. Equipment expenditures had leveled off the middle of the second quarter. Seasonally adjusted auto sales began a continuing decline. We all know of the recession in the housing industry brought on by attempts on the part of the Federal Reserve to unilaterally control the economy with measures that could at best be called awkward. Production as a percentage of capacity began a steady decline midway in the second quarter of 1966.

Mr. President, it seems to me that whether you are a micro- or macro-economist, whatever your economic cosmos of concentration, these are not signs of unsustained growth. They are signs of fluctuations in our free market that, if left alone, would have resulted in an adjustment permitting us to grow economically in a continued upswing instead of being continually plagued by teeterings on the brink of economic uncertainty brought on by those who cannot adjust to "positive growth economics." I do not suggest that these individuals or schools of economic thought be embalmed with their theoretical heritage, but one is tempted.

I turn now from the past to the immediate present. Here, again, a look at the indicators give rise to increased concern. As the First National City Bank of New York has said, "the economy has not been following the administrations' script." I have no doubt, it is probably written in *olde English*.

The industrial production index for February was off 2.1 points from January's revised figure of 158.0. Motor vehicle production continued its serious decline. The rise in steel production is quite slight and the increase in utilities production again is marginal. Business equipment output showed an unexpected drop, it was 1.3 percent lower in February from January figures that had already been revised downward.

This makes February the lowest month in this area since September of 1966. Poorer profit expectations for the first quarter remain a fairly sure reality. January's inventory accumulation continued unusually high.

Mr. President, if this apparent business decline continues, concurrent with both peaking in inventory investment

and capital expenditures, there should be steps taken to counteract these effects of past economic misdeeds, and later in this speech I shall outline what I feel the economy needs in addition to an immediate and retroactive restoration of the investment tax credit.

But to continue with our necrology, Mr. President, total personal income has begun to level off. Net farm income, including new inventory change, continues its yearlong decline. Corporate after-tax profits began to decline in early 1966 and, as I stated above, the present picture is not encouraging. The effect a continuation of this pattern could have on Treasury revenues should be of greater concern than the loss on paper occasioned by retroactive restoration of the tax-investment credit, particularly in view of what many economists consider overoptimistic tax-revenue expectations by the administration. In all components, weekly hours of work have dropped significantly with a drop registered in durable goods of 1 full hour. Average weekly earnings have dropped in all manufacturing industries. Both the wholesale and retail price indexes are fairly stable. The homebuilding industry and the automobile industries still present a very disturbing picture. While homebuilding has bottomed out despite the statistical freak for housing starts in January, the administration and the Federal Reserve Board should see what is implied here—substantial economic trends cannot be remedied and, fortunately, squelched by instant action measures.

Senate speeches given by me on August 19, 1966, and March 16 of this year have made clear my position and the concurrence of many economic analysts representing highly reputable forums of economic expression. You cannot successfully lessen demand by reducing the means of satisfying that demand. To think that reduction in productive capacity will have a traceable effect on consumer demand other than that occasioned by admittedly unacceptable levels of unemployment is, to my thinking, something straight from Lewis Carroll.

Mr. President, I think the indicators clearly demand the restoration of the investment credit. They demand it in equity and from sound economic reasoning. I shall belabor no further the fact that it was not needed to begin with and one strongly suspects that it was a fiscal bone thrown to the Federal Reserve Board in exchange for easier money. As I believe I deduced from Chairman Martin in testimony before the Finance Committee on this bill, the Reserve Board is influencing directly the fiscal policies of the administration with intimations of monetary strangulation.

Mr. President, the statement was made in both prepared statements and in answers to specific questions at hearings, that the suspension of the investment credit and the accelerated depreciation were not revenue measures. They were to cool off the economy and prevent the Federal Reserve Board making the economy too "snug," to use Chairman Martin's word. This declaration on the part of the administration that the apparent gain, at least in this sector of revenue

collection, was not of significance as revenue, would seem to lead us logically to the next step in this syllogism. If the restoration of the credit is a move to stimulate the economy, as, I believe, recent Federal spending, pump-priming moves have also been, then to make the restoration retroactive to the original date would further the stated economic aims of the administration. This is a strictly economic situation. We need to stimulate the economy. A review of the indicators shows this to be obvious. To claim that retroactivity would represent an inequitable windfall to those that had, in their best business judgment, to expand, is to indulge in ethical posturing. What is meant by a windfall is open to definition. I, for one, cannot imagine responsible boards of directors of American industry voting themselves a month in Montego Bay, Jamaica, after receiving a return of these funds. These funds will be used to make their businesses stronger, more competitive, more productive and, to the Treasury's direct interest, better producers of Federal revenues.

To repeal the suspension of the tax credit suspension and the accelerated depreciation is a sound economic move designed to provide needed stimulus to the economy. To repeal it retroactively to October 9, if one follows administration reasoning to its logical conclusion, would also be sound economics.

My position, supported by massive public support from industry, is that retroactivity should be approved by the Senate and include House language that increases the credit amount from 25 to 50 percent for amounts over \$25,000.

Mr. President, the last economic indicator that I shall discuss as a major sign of threatening economic slowdown is the relationship between the decline in total sales and the continued increase in inventories even though overall production in industry has declined. When you have inventories rising high above sales, both absolutely and as a ratio, particularly in the face of declining and decreased production, a very serious look must be taken at the consumer side of the economy. This look should take into consideration, not only an increase in savings and a definite slowing of the rise in retail sales, but the psychological impact on the average man of our yo-yo economic measures.

Inventories in business have risen from \$132,392,000,000 to \$136,520,000,000 between October 1966 and January 1967. Sales, however, began a decrease in November and the January figure is down to \$87,849,000,000 from \$87,875,000,000. This situation gives rise to concern but when it is coupled with a clear-cut decline in production in total industrial production and clear cut declines in production of selected manufacturers, a very close look must be taken into means to stimulate demand across the board. The industrial production index, seasonally adjusted, decreased in February for the second consecutive month with a decline of 1.3 percent. Total manufacturing dropped from 161.5 in October 1966 to 157.9 in February 1967, a drop of 3.6 percent, taking 1957 through 1959, as 100, seasonally adjusted.

This, Mr. President, would seem to make clear the point that not only is there a need to provide a long run increase in productive capacity, but if that capacity is to make economic sense, there must be an immediate stimulation of the consumer markets in this country across the board.

Productive capacity is worse than useless if there is no demand for the product; it represents a drain on both corporate, individual and Government revenues. not only is it annoying, it is expensive—expensive in revenue and employment.

Mr. President, I believe it to be in the best interests of the consumer and, therefore, of industry that an excise tax cut in both automobiles and communications is in order. This cut in taxes would provide needed cash for the purchase of consumer goods, which purchases, according to the current retail reports of the Commerce Department, have slowed in growth despite the relentless growth in consumers.

The automobile industry is obviously in an uncomfortable situation. Sales according to the latest figures supplied by the National Association of Auto Dealers show a drop in sales of 25 percent from last year. The impact of this industry and those closely connected to it on the economy is well known.

A serious decline in this sector is not to be taken lightly. A remedy must be found, and I feel that it is to stimulate sales through a cut in excise taxes. The amendment I propose would cut excise taxes on automobiles from the present 7 to 4 percent, effective on date of final enactment. There is, however, language included to provide for a reimbursement for the difference in the taxes for automobiles purchased after my speech of March 16, wherein I originally proposed this tax cut. A cut of this nature would not only result in an increase in automobile sales, but it would also provide extra funds for further stimulation of consumer consumption. Savings figures as a percentage of disposable income is up from 4.8 in the third quarter of 1966 to 5.9 only 3 months later, at the end of calendar 1966. These extra funds, coupled with moneys freed by an excise tax cut, would provide stimulus not only to automobiles, as I have said, but to the economy as a whole. This amendment, Mr. President, is, I feel, clearly in the economic interests of the country.

Mr. President, I call attention at this time to an article entitled "Chrysler Plans Layoffs in April—21,000 Men in United States To Be Idle 5 Days," written by William D. Smith, and published in the New York Times of Saturday, April 1, 1967.

The article states:

The Chrysler Corporation announced yesterday it would lay off 21,000 production workers for five days during April because of a sharp decline in the company's auto assembly schedule for the month.

The article also states, referring to the big inventories which I cited in the general industry:

A Chrysler spokesman said the production cutback was made to reduce inventories of new cars. Chrysler's sales this year through

March 20 are down 15.6 per cent from the year-earlier level.

Here is a significant point:

Chrysler's sales decline is nonetheless the smallest of any of the Nation's major auto makers. Over-all industry sales are down 20.9 per cent for the January 1-March 20 period.

The article further points out that—

The Chrysler plants to be affected are Lynch Road (Detroit) in the week beginning April 3rd; Hamtramck (Detroit) and St. Louis in the week of April 10; Los Angeles in the week of April 17 and Newark, Delaware, and Belvidere, Illinois, in the week of April 24.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HARTKE. Another area, Mr. President, that is due; rather overdue, for a lowering in excise taxes, is the area of communications. This tax presently at 10 percent, after the very brief lowering of it in 1965, should be lowered to 3 percent, effective May 1. This effective date would permit the companies involved to have some leadtime in changing their billings.

This cut, again, Mr. President, would provide needed consumer dollars for stimulation of consumer demand to be met by an expansion in production capacity engendered, in turn by credit easing and investment credits. This approach to growth is, I believe, the answer to increased demand. Expand productive capacity; do not stall the economy with awkward and ill-timed fiscal and monetary controls that are effected on the basis of estimates that have regularly been incorrect. These two tax cuts, coupled with the restoration of the investment credit and accelerated depreciation retroactive to October 9, 1966, should provide the total economy with the fuel necessary for it to move forward.

Mr. President, Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board, in answer to a question of mine about the effect of revenues of tax cuts over the past 15 years stated that there was not, to his knowledge, a tax cut that did not result in an increase in aggregate Treasury revenues. And I was trying desperately today to have the acting chairman of the Committee on Finance, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] give us an estimate of the revenues that would be involved. I have sent a wire this afternoon to the quadripartite, the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, the Director of the Budget, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Chairman of the Economic Council, Mr. Ackley, requesting them to submit information showing this amount in time for the debate on this measure.

In 15 years we have still not learned this lesson. Here is an opportunity to begin in earnest the use of "positive growth economics."

The sector loss of revenue to the Treasury of the automobile excise tax cut

would be \$177 million in fiscal 1967 and \$513 million in fiscal 1968. The sector loss for the communications excise tax cut would be \$98 million in fiscal 1967 and \$703 million in fiscal 1968. This totals to \$1,875,000,000 in fiscal 1967 and \$2,816,000,000 in fiscal 1968. I maintain, Mr. President, that the aggregate revenues generated by the passage of these extra funds through the economy would more than offset the sector revenue loss occasioned by the lowering of these taxes.

Mr. President, I propose these amendments—and intend to offer them—only after a close study of the indicators and very recent communications with leaders of economic thought in the Nation. I have here a telegram from Mr. William F. Butler, vice president for economic research of the Chase Manhattan Bank. It reads as follows:

Believe you are wise in calling for reductions in excises on autos and telephone calls. Stimulus to consumer markets would be highly useful. Experience shows that a balanced tax reduction applying to both consumption and investment is the best route.

I also have a letter from Mr. Olsen, senior vice president and economist of the First National City Bank. The letter reads:

FIRST NATIONAL CITY BANK,
New York, N.Y., March 17, 1967.

HON. VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: I was pleased to hear that you plan to propose reduction in certain excise taxes as an amendment to the investment tax credit restoration bill. The reduction in excise taxes on automobiles is particularly desirable in light of the present slow sales performance. Despite substantial increases in personal income in December and again in January, consumers have increased their rate of savings and reduced expenditures. They have also slowed down sharply their net consumer credit borrowings. The consumer does not feel in a position to improve his rate of expenditure, and a reduction in these excise taxes might very well encourage him. Indeed, the uncertainties about imposition of the 6 per cent surtax may be a consideration in the consumer's cautious attitude. With inventories at unusually high levels and still growing, further slowdown in demand is going to make the inventory adjustment more difficult and drawn out. Continued discouragement to consumption will not help matters.

Auto companies are being directed to add new safety features to current and next year's models. The consumer must pay for these safety features despite the fact that if left to a free choice he might elect not to purchase them. A reduction in the excise tax, therefore, would help to offset these extra charges.

The reduction in the telephone excise tax would help the consumer's overall budget, making it possible for him to direct expenditures to other services or goods, in line with the general need to encourage an improvement in consumption.

You have my permission to incorporate this into the hearings if you so choose. Best personal wishes.

Sincerely yours,

LEIF.

I also have a letter from Prof. Paul A. Samuelson, institute professor at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, supporting my amendments to reduce excise taxes, which reads as follows, under date of March 20:

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE
OF TECHNOLOGY,
Cambridge, Mass., March 20, 1967.

Senator VANCE HARTKE,
Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: I do think this might be a good time to make progress toward reducing excise taxes at the Federal level. The auto and (with less urgency) the telephone taxes might make a promising beginning.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL A. SAMUELSON,
Institute Professor.

Professor Samuelson is one of the outstanding men in this field.

I have relied throughout this speech on analyses also prepared by Townsend-Greenspan & Co., of New York, internationally known and respected economic analysts. Their figures and conclusion agree with and reinforce those gathered from other sources. Here, Mr. President, is a consensus of economic opinion, iterated by veritable pundits in the field. I ask that my colleagues heed them.

I ask unanimous consent that the figures and the analysis be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the time has then come for Congress to show that it is able to respond to the total economy in a balanced manner with a balanced program. This is in the interest of the Nation, the economy, the consumer, and, quite significantly, the present Congress.

I hope that some of those who are interested in the effects of these amendments will understand that I was opposed to the suspension of the investment tax credit. I felt that the investment tax credit was a good proposal. It was a tax credit of 7 percent, which is the equivalent of giving to business a depreciation on its equipment of 114 percent.

I was opposed to the suspension of the tax credit last fall, and I believe that the evidence now demonstrates that action by Congress was not alone ill timed and ill conceived, but also was economically unsound, and I am glad to help rectify the mistake of last fall.

Therefore, it is my intention to vote for a tax cut for business and industry in the amount of this 7-percent tax credit. I am hopeful that we will not penalize those companies which, by reason of economic necessity, were forced to continue their investment and their progress—penalize them for 7 months out of a period of almost 4½ years. In other words, we provided the 7-percent investment tax credit in 1962. We suspended it in October of 1966. We propose to make it effective again in March of 1967.

So, in less than a 5-year period, we have had an on-again, off-again tax credit for business.

We have had the same policy in the field of excise taxes—that is, national sales taxes—which I opposed from the time I came to Congress. We finally were able to eliminate these sales taxes in 1965. Then we eliminated them for a short period of time, and then we reim-

posed the sales taxes on automobiles and telephones.

Incidentally, part of the sales taxes on automobiles was for highway beautification. I might point out that none of it was for highway safety. This is just an aside, but it demonstrates the lack of continued emphasis and the lack of continued priority of those things which demand our attention. I certainly am in favor of highway beautification, but I believe we should do something about saving the lives of some projected 65,000 people who will be killed on the highways.

At the same time, I am in favor of providing the same type of treatment for the consumer as we are providing for business and industry. I am in favor of the tax credit for business and industry. I am in favor of providing for reinstitution of the tax cut for the consumer by eliminating the increase in the sales taxes from 4 to 7 percent, which is the reverse way of saying I want to reduce the excise tax from 7 to 4 percent. I want to reduce the excise tax on telephone calls from 10 to 3 percent.

Mr. President, I ask that the amendments be printed. I intend to call them up at a later time. I hope that the Members of the Senate will give these matters their serious consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments (Nos. 144 through 146) will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

EXHIBIT 1

CHRYSLER PLANS LAYOFFS IN APRIL—21,000
MEN IN UNITED STATES TO BE IDLE 5 DAYS—
AMERICAN MOTORS STEPPING UP PRODUCTION

(By William D. Smith)

The Chrysler Corporation announced yesterday it would lay off 21,000 production workers for 5 days during April because of a sharp decline in the company's auto assembly schedule for the month.

The American Motors Corporation, on the other hand, said it was calling back 6,500 employees after a week's layoff. The company also announced that it was scheduling a 40 per cent increase in the production of its Rambler American line to 244 cars a day from 175 cars a day.

Chrysler said it would build some 87,300 cars at its domestic assembly plants in April, about a 31 per cent drop from the production of April, 1966. A Chrysler spokesman said six of the company's seven assembly plants in the United States would suspend operations for one 5-day period each during April.

BIG INVENTORIES CITED

A Chrysler spokesman said the production cutback was made to reduce inventories of new cars. Chrysler's sales this year through March 20 are down 15.6 per cent from the year-earlier level.

Chrysler's sales decline is nonetheless the smallest of any of the nation's major auto makers. Over-all industry sales are down 20.9 per cent for the January 1-March 20 period.

The Chrysler plants to be affected are Lynch Road (Detroit) in the week beginning April 3; Hamtramck (Detroit) and St. Louis in the week of April 10; Los Angeles in the week of April 17 and Newark, Del., and Belvidere, Ill., in the week of April 24.

The company's Jefferson Avenue plant in Detroit, which builds Chryslers and Imperials will continue regular operations.

CLOSING IN CANADA, TOO

Chrysler Canada, Ltd., a subsidiary, also announced yesterday that it would shut its Windsor, Ont., assembly plant for 5 working

days. This closing will affect about 5,000 workers, in addition to the 21,000 being laid off in the United States.

William V. Luneburg, president of American Motors, said his company's production increase was necessary to meet shortages of Rambler American cars that were developing in many areas of the country.

Mr. Luneburg said public response to the company's February 21 price cuts of \$154 to \$234 on the Rambler American had been greater than expected. He said sales of the model had increased to nearly double the January rate.

Sales at American Motors are trailing last year's pace by 22.7 per cent. Since the price cut, however, the company's sales position has improved in relation to those of the other auto makers.

E. M. Estes, vice president of the General Motors Corporation and general manager of its Chevrolet division, said yesterday that he expected dealer sales for March to total about 160,000 new cars, down from the 221,000 cars sold in March, 1966. But he said there were "definite indications that a real spring upturn in sales is taking place."

EXHIBIT 2

[From Townsend-Greenspan & Co., Inc.,
Mar. 17, 1967]

BUSINESS OUTLOOK

GENERAL BUSINESS

The industrial production index for February was off a surprising 2.1 points from January's revised figure of 158.0. We had expected a more modest falloff based on the assumption that production in the capital goods industries and other areas of the economy, for which only monthly data are available, would show only marginal declines. As it turned out, the figures show that motor vehicle production was down pretty much as anticipated. There was a slight rise in steel and a marginal increase in utilities production. Business equipment output which we had expected to evidence little change was, in fact, a surprising 1.3% lower in February following a downward revision for January. The preliminary January index for business equipment implied a continuation of the upward trend of output to record levels in January. Revised data now indicate that January's seasonally adjusted output was actually down, albeit only modestly, with February at the lowest level for this component since September 1966. Production curtailments are also suggested for military aircraft although the production of ordnance apparently continued to edge up a notch last month. Unofficial estimates from the Pentagon indicate air ordnance production at 93,000 tons in February which was probably up slightly from the January level. (97,000 tons are scheduled for March.)

In other areas of the economy, preliminary estimates show textile and apparel production for February off 2%, after seasonal adjustment, from January's index which was revised downward significantly. Early indications are for a further erosion in this category in March. Not unexpectedly, home goods production was lower and, to make matters worse, even the large food component was a shade lower last month.

There are some marginally favorable characteristics in the pattern of industrial activity last month. Despite the sharp drop in manufacturing output, unit labor costs in February apparently did not show any further rise following the large increase which occurred in January. It is possible that the abrupt falloff in overtime in February improved output per man-hour enough to offset rising average hourly pay. However, it is more likely that January's rise in unit labor costs was a statistical aberration and that the average of January and February is a more relevant indicator of what is happening during the first quarter. Although sufficient

detail is lacking to make a firm judgment on February profit margins, it seems unlikely that further erosion occurred last month. Notwithstanding this, our original expectations of a rather poorer first quarter profit showing remain unaltered.

Industrial activity for March is currently running under the February levels, especially if further declines in capital goods production are projected. How much of a decline is to be expected in the March index is as yet indeterminate.

As of a fortnight ago, our over-all judgment of the state of the economy was, that while there was a general weakening in the consumer goods sector, the upward thrust of production in both business and defense equipment would keep the slippage of industrial activity in the months immediately ahead to a minimum. Originally, the decline in plant and equipment expenditures during the first quarter of 1967, indicated by the most recent SEC-Department of Commerce Plant and Equipment Survey, seemed unreasonable in light of the apparent strength in capital goods production as shown by the Federal Reserve Board's index. But in view of the sudden weakness now being evidenced in capital goods production, we can no longer look upon the surprising downturn in plant and equipment expenditures suggested by the survey as a statistical fluke. The most reasonable anticipation is still that the dollar expenditures on plant and equipment in the current quarter are running somewhat higher on average than in the fourth quarter of 1966. However, the evidence of an imminent turn in plant and equipment expenditures is beginning to grow. If so, a substantial further decline in capital goods and associated production is to be expected for the remainder of this year, despite the restoration of the investment tax credit. It certainly seems unreasonable to expect that defense production will actually decline in months immediately ahead but obviously some slowing in the rate of growth of that sector is near at hand.

Unfortunately, very little of the current weakening in industrial activity is traceable to a drop in the level of inventory investment. January's inventory accumulation remained surprisingly high. There may have been some slippage in inventory investment in February although there is little statistical evidence to suggest that this was the case. Retail sales continue soft. Passenger car sales are obviously the most dramatic area of weakness, but nonautomotive retail activity can be described as only a moderate offset. The evidence for consumer goods markets and plant and equipment expenditures, coupled with the fact that final goods production was off as much as the materials segment in the industrial production index suggests little in the way of a reduction in inventory investment within the manufacturing area.

If this is the case, the decline in business activity still has a good way to go both in scope and time. The development of a concurrent peaking in both inventory investment and plant and equipment expenditures has historically been the major element in an industrial recession.

That homebuilding will provide support for the economy still remains a projection rather than a realization. As we have indicated previously, the sudden upswing in housing starts in January was a statistical fiction fed by the fact that conventional seasonal adjustment factors for this series reflect only the impact of weather. Consequently, the sharp increases in seasonally adjusted housing starts for January in the Northeastern and North Central states turned into an abrupt decline in February. Over-all seasonally adjusted starts last month returned to their December levels. Building permits also weakened, but less so than in the case of starts. We would not be surprised to see a further slippage in

the seasonally adjusted starts rates for the month of March although this is by no means certain. Generally, homebuilding by any standard, has bottomed out and it is only a question of time before it begins to exhibit some firming tendencies.

Expectations of any near-term or major improvement in this market are not realistic, however. There is some evidence that the underlying backlog of home demand may be slightly less than had previously been suggested. Home buying in the Western states, even in projects where mortgage money is available, is running somewhat below expectations. It is, needless to say, almost impossible to tell what the state of home buying demand is in the Eastern and North Central states. Clearer evidence in these sectors of the country will require the emergence of spring.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

Last week the business community was presented with a surprisingly bearish report on plans for plant and equipment expenditures which evoked a Presidential request for the restoration of the investment tax credit. Regarding the business outlook, the net effect of these events must be considered negative.

The SEC-Department of Commerce survey of American business' plant and equipment expenditure plans for calendar 1967 indicated an increase of only 3.9% over 1966 levels. This was based on data available in late January and early February and it must be presumed that, if anything, plans have been scaled down somewhat more during the past month. These figures, needless to say, are decidedly less optimistic than the most recent McGraw-Hill survey of capital spending, taken early in January, which showed a projected increase of 6.3%. The implicit sharp downward revision between, say the first two weeks of January and early February, is doubtless more statistical than real. In past years, concurrent surveys taken in March and April by McGraw-Hill and the SEC-Department of Commerce respectively showed a definite upward bias, usually averaging about two percentage points, in the McGraw-Hill figures. Analysis of both surveys historically shows that the government estimate has been by far the more accurate of the two. Accordingly, the reported 6.3% increase in the McGraw-Hill survey probably has an upward bias built into it. Thus, the discrepancy between the two most recent surveys may not be a reflection of any change in plans, but rather a difference in sampling and collection.

This is not to say, however, that the latest government projection implying less than a 4% increase in plant and equipment expenditures can, in and of itself, be taken at face value. The Administration survey requested that the companies also project their expenditure plans for both the first and second quarters of this year. After summing and seasonally adjusting the capital expenditure data for the first half, an estimate for the second half of this year was derived by subtraction. This yielded the rather unbelievable result of a decline in expenditures for the first two quarters followed by somewhat higher outlays during the July-December period.

In the first instance, it is rather difficult to imagine current dollar figures on plant and equipment expenditures actually declining in the first quarter of 1967. The same government report showed that, on a seasonally adjusted basis, new starts of capital projects by manufacturers during the fourth quarter of 1966 were still above the rate of expenditures, causing the backlog of uncompleted projects to continue to rise. The same pattern exists for public utilities. This is consistent with the structure of orders and backlogs for new capital equipment. Appropriations on a seasonally adjusted basis

were actually up slightly during the fourth quarter of 1966 for manufacturers and, while definitely below the second quarter 1966 peak, were nevertheless at high levels. New orders for plant and equipment were somewhat lower last quarter, but here again, the evidence hardly suggests lower outlays this quarter.

We would thus argue that while we find the expenditure increases for the year as a whole consistent with the structure of orders, backlogs and commitments, we believe outlays in the first half will be somewhat higher than officially projected, with the second half being lower than is implied in the survey.

Potentially, the restoration of the investment tax credit and accelerated depreciation is going to make capital expenditures in 1967 higher than would otherwise be the case. In a government survey taken in December, businessmen had reported that capital expenditures plans for 1967 had been reduced \$2.3 billion as a result of the suspension of these tax benefits. Our best guess is that the restoration at this time would probably reinstate about \$1.5 billion of the postponed or cancelled projects. The effect of the investment tax credit is the equivalent of a 7% discount on the price of equipment. This can have quite a significant impact on modernization and cost reduction programs. It is, of course, unlikely that any capacity expansion projects will be affected, but these were probably only marginally influenced by the investment tax credit in the first place.

FEDERAL TAX RECEIPTS

In our Analysis of the Federal Budget of February 10th, we indicated that Budget estimates of tax revenues from individuals were rather generous for fiscal year 1968. The enclosed set of tables is a detailed reconciliation of personal income, taxable income, tax liabilities and tax payments.

The cut in individual tax rates for calendar years 1964 and 1965 amounted to 4.8% of 1964 taxable income. The average drop in tax liabilities was only 3.8% of taxable income in 1965. With the existing income distribution of taxpayers, an average increase of one percent in the income per taxpayer, because it tends to shift all taxpayers up a notch on the income scale, increases the average tax liabilities per dollar of income by 1/10 of 1%. Accordingly, the near 10% rise in average taxable income between 1963 and 1965 caused an increase of one percentage point in tax liabilities as a percent of taxable income. (The difference between the actual decline of 3.8% in 1965 and 4.8% in 1964.) The 5.5% rise in average taxable income in 1966 had the effect of increasing the average tax rate from 19.3% to 19.9% of taxable income. Much more important, however, was the very significant decline in the proportion of taxable personal income which was not reported to the Internal Revenue Service. Our rough estimates suggest that nonreported income fell last year by \$9 billion and, hence, increased individual tax liabilities by approximately \$1.8 billion.

An analysis of the underlying assumptions in the fiscal 1966 budget document indicates that a further decline in nonreported income of approximately \$4 billion is expected by the Administration. Since it is by no means clear why the sharp drop in nonreported taxable income occurred in 1966, the anticipation of a further decline this year, though it is only one-half of last year's decline, opens up to question the individual tax revenue estimates.

With the normal updrift in average tax yields and assuming fifty percent of the requested 6% surcharge is applicable to calendar year 1967, average tax liabilities are projected in the Budget to rise to 21.0% of taxable income. Should the \$4 billion decrease in nonreported income fail to materialize, revenues could be \$800 million less

than projected. Moreover, if personal income falls below the Council of Economic Advisers' \$624 billion figure for this year (as we expect it will), individual tax liabilities could slip far below projections. Thus, since it is unlikely that nontaxable personal income (transfer payments, etc.) will be pared, a fall in personal income, for example, to \$617 billion would lower taxable income from the projected \$322 billion to \$315 billion. Such a shortfall would have the effect not only of reducing the taxable income base, but also of reducing the updrift into higher tax brackets by the taxpaying public. Thus, instead of a projected \$67.8 billion of tax liabilities, the figure would be closer to \$65.6 billion even under the assumption of a further decline in nonreported taxable income. A combination of both lower personal income and no change in nonreported income could decrease individual tax liabilities for the current calendar year by \$2.5 billion—\$3 billion.

U.S. SENATOR CARL HAYDEN

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the greatly respected and much loved President pro tempore of the U.S. Senate, CARL HAYDEN, was the subject of admiring remarks by the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, on March 22. Speaking before the American Society of Foresters, the Secretary related some of the developments that have occurred during Senator HAYDEN's lifetime—developments of great moment in the history of our Nation—and related Senator HAYDEN's own career to these events.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the Secretary's remarks concerning Senator HAYDEN be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE MAN FROM HAYDEN'S FERRY

(Excerpts from remarks by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall)

One of the things in which I take considerable personal pride is the fact that by accident of birth, Carl Hayden and I were both born in Arizona. As a matter of fact, our Arizona roots go back to the same span of time. The Senator's father first entered Arizona in 1858 on a wagon train from Santa Fe; my great-grandfather, an Indian scout probing southward from Utah first penetrated the Arizona border in the very same year.

The geography of our native state is misleading. Many persons whose acquaintanceship of Arizona is limited to western movies or airline travel folders are convinced that we have lots of sand and sahualo cactus and mesquite, horseback riding trails through the desert, and mid-winter sunbathing—with snow-clad mountains in the far-off distance.

But the fact is, we have hundreds of square miles of forest lands. Some enthusiastic claims have been made, in fact, that we have the largest virgin stand of ponderosa pine in the country. We do have pines and mountains, and national parks and ski slopes to go with our winter resort sections in the lower valleys.

All this is to introduce the subject of Carl Hayden's never-diminishing curiosity, his always active interest in his native state, and his unfailing memory of things and places and events.

Back before the turn of the century, before most of us here were born, a young graduate of Tempe Normal—now Arizona State University—and a group of friends set

out on a graduation trip to see more of the territory. By horseback and wagon they headed north from the Salt River Valley, climbed out of the lower country onto the Mogollon Rim and into what is now the Coconino National Forest south of Flagstaff. They climbed the San Francisco peaks north of Flagstaff, then went on for a leisurely look at the Grand Canyon, getting a glimpse of country now in the Kaibab National Forest.

They returned to Tempe by a different route, through what is now the Tonto National Forest—Zane Grey country before that western novelist went to work on it—down the mountain past the place where Roosevelt Dam now stands, a monument to the early reclamation planners, stopping for a visit at prehistoric cliff dwellings before proceeding back to the desert lowlands.

They spend a month, or perhaps six weeks (Carl would remember exactly), and it is an experience, even today, to sit and listen to Senator Hayden's stories of that trip. With that kind of interest in his state, is it any wonder that the voters there have kept him in Congress longer than any other person has ever served as a lawmaker in the history of the republic? And the voters have done this largely without the knowledge of how Carl Hayden, year-in, year-out, with no publicity, has quietly appropriated money for conservation of all natural resources for the ultimate benefit of both users of these resources and the general public.

It is amazing to think of the time span covered by the life of the man you honor here today. He was born in 1877 in an adobe house still standing in the City of Tempe near the south bank of the Salt River. The settlement then was named for his father, Hayden's Ferry, and the United States, numbering considerably fewer than the present 50, was just beginning its second century. As a nation we are still so young that a man now serving in the United States Senate has lived almost half our nationhood (if there is such a word).

When Carl Hayden was born we had just begun to pollute our rivers and lakes beyond their capacity to resist and constantly renew themselves. We still had the idea that somehow or other we had to subjugate the land—clear cut the forest lands to make way for farms (and the dust bowls which would follow), drain the swamps, and destroy the waterfowl, plough under the prairie grasses and lose the top soil.

We have caused a lot of damage to the ecology in Carl Hayden's lifetime, but we've learned a lot, too, about how to correct our mistakes, and the progress we've made can be attributed in large part to the farsightedness of this one-time frontier sheriff, this Man from Hayden's Ferry who has supported the legislation and provided the money to help us turn over to tomorrow's citizens a land that is liveable.

Not only is Carl Hayden living as rich and full a life, as meaningful and memorable life as anyone can hope to live, but he has seen the closing of the frontier, in 1890, and the opening of the frontiers of outer space within the past decade. His life bridges yesterday, today, and tomorrow.

He has served the following Presidents: Woodrow Wilson, Warren Harding, Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, John Kennedy, and Lyndon Johnson. And there is not one President who has not sought out and listened to the advice and counsel of Carl Hayden. They have known him for the rugged country from which he comes; they have known him for the rock he has proven himself to be in times of great domestic and international crises. But most of all, they have known him for his deep and abiding humanity, and his understanding of this fact: that though political parties and their leaders may come and go, the burdens

of the Presidency and the needs of the American people in an ever-changing world, go on and on.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 4, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 3, 1967:

U.S. ATTORNEY

James Patrick Rielly, of Iowa, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Iowa for the term of 4 years, vice Donald M. Statton, resigned.

FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BOARD

Jonathan Davis, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring March 31, 1973.

IN THE COAST GUARD RESERVE

The following-named officer of the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve for promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

Capt. Merton W. Stoffie

U.S. COAST GUARD

The following-named officers of the U.S. Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

Capt. Roderick Y. Edwards	Capt. Ross P. Bullard
Capt. Robert W. Goehring	Capt. Orvan R. Smeder

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

James E. Ivey, Albertville, Ala., in place of S. B. Hooper, retired.

Charles C. Polk, Jr., Grady, Ala., in place of A. H. Hyatt, retired.

ALASKA

Wilmer C. Grout, Aniak, Alaska, in place of M. C. Higginbotham, Jr., resigned.

Bernice K. Lundgren, Naknek, Alaska, in place of F. A. Davey, resigned.

Gloria O. Day, Valdez, Alaska, in place of D. F. Huls, resigned.

ARIZONA

Stark E. Stephenson, Elfrida, Ariz., in place of D. J. McKinsey, transferred.

B. Hughe Mullins, Ganado, Ariz., in place of M. M. Looney, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Emma L. Wisenhunt, Norphlet, Ark., in place of M. M. Suagee, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Elizabeth P. Zachary, Adelanto, Calif., in place of Agnes Mairose, retired.

Robert S. Senini, Delano, Calif., in place of Ward Robertson, retired.

Lim P. Lee, San Francisco, Calif., in place of J. F. Fixa, retired.

Robert V. Newell, Twentynine Palms, Calif., in place of M. M. Kennedy, retired.

Charles B. Herald, Jr., Yountville, Calif., in place of R. J. Schulze, deceased.

COLORADO

Joseph R. Montano, Antonito, Colo., in place of W. D. Joyce, retired.

Maxine A. Steele, Bennett, Colo., in place of F. P. Steffen, deceased.

Axel T. Bernhard, Granby, Colo., in place of G. W. Snider, retired.
Barbara M. Spencer, Ouray, Colo., in place of M. H. McCullough, retired.

FLORIDA

Kenneth L. Rhodes, Lake Wales, Fla., in place of F. S. Smith, retired.

GEORGIA

Lon P. Black, Dawson, Ga., in place of A. H. Thomas, retired.
Eugene C. Grant, Tate, Ga., in place of V. H. Doss, retired.

HAWAII

Hazel K. Kobayashi, Kealia, Hawaii, in place of Kenichi Masunaga, retired.
Shigeo O. Ishibashi, Makaweli, Hawaii, in place of J. K. Saito, retired.
Toshie Nagata, Mountainview, Hawaii, in place of Anna Durbenuick, retired.

ILLINOIS

Frances M. Trowbridge, Beason, Ill., in place of Roland Horney, retired.
Hubert L. Goforth, Carbondale, Ill., in place of V. J. Brown, retired.
Walter L. Moss, Eldred, Ill., in place of W. B. Martin, retired.
Harold R. Bonar, El Paso, Ill., in place of P. J. Roth, retired.
Franklin D. McFarland, Forsyth, Ill., in place of Marvin Randall, retired.
Lynn O. Ogg, Gibson City, Ill., in place of H. L. Ernst, retired.
Roland F. Laking, Grant Park, Ill., in place of H. E. Price, deceased.
Donald E. Flagg, Keithsburg, Ill., in place of G. E. Leibengood, resigned.
Marion G. Jahn, Lee Center, Ill., in place of H. W. Wellman, retired.
Ruth L. Hood, South Elgin, Ill., in place of R. F. Winkler, transferred.
William Lippert, Washington, Ill., in place of J. W. Norris, retired.
Noble D. Lowery, Westfield, Ill., in place of H. C. Strader, retired.

INDIANA

Howard J. Green, Cross Plains, Ind., in place of Hazel Runner, retired.
Joe Silotto, Dana, Ind., in place of Beatrice Bales, retired.

IOWA

Raymond F. Weber, Fairbank, Iowa, in place of J. F. Rechkemmer, deceased.
Leota M. Ekle, Gilbert, Iowa, in place of A. L. Dickinson, retired.

KENTUCKY

Thomas J. Carnes, Alexandria, Ky., in place of F. L. Gosney, retired.
Ruby M. Gish, Bremen, Ky., in place of Verdie Whitmer, retired.
John M. Hiles, Jr., Foster, Ky., in place of Leland Bonar, deceased.
Billie J. Pennington, Tilford, Ky., in place of G. N. Deaton, resigned.

LOUISIANA

Edmond J. Michel, Marksville, La., in place of J. O. Brouillette, retired.

MAINE

I. James Coolbrith, Long Island, Maine, in place of E. E. Clarke, retired.

MARYLAND

Lois J. Horney, Chester, Md., in place of O. A. Gardner, retired.
Ward K. Livengood, Friendsville, Md., in place of C. M. Friend, retired.
Romie G. Robbins, Linkwood, Md., in place of J. A. Vincent, retired.
Guy L. Widdowson, Westover, Md., in place of J. R. Richards, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Joseph P. Dahdah, Feeding Hills, Mass., in place of J. D. Cleary, retired.
William T. Trant, Westfield, Mass., in place of R. P. McMahon, retired.

MICHIGAN

Deanna D. Selke, Hawks, Mich., in place of M. M. Prell, retired.

Lawrence A. Stachnik, Maple City, Mich., in place of G. K. Dechow, retired.
Delos R. Griffin, Oshtemo, Mich., in place of A. P. Verderbar, retired.

MINNESOTA

Oliver Medalen, Belgrade, Minn., in place of E. E. Vig, retired.
Francis E. Osborne, Madelia, Minn., in place of L. E. Sullivan, retired.
Edward J. Pietrek, Sturgeon Lake, Minn., in place of J. M. Cunningham, transferred.

MISSISSIPPI

Charlie M. Woods, Bolton, Miss., in place of J. R. Krack, retired.
Essie C. Sanders, Tinsley, Miss., in place of M. L. Bennett, retired.
Bettie P. Webb, Tunica, Miss., in place of N. T. Poore, resigned.

MISSOURI

Leonard G. Drummond, Coffey, Mo., in place of E. F. Stewart, retired.
Billy D. Harwood, Flar Grove, Mo., in place of J. C. Godwin, retired.

MONTANA

Clara P. Evans, Lakeside, Mont., in place of R. B. Evans, deceased.
Leneus H. Erickson, Turner, Mont., in place of C. N. Simons, retired.

NEBRASKA

Roy E. Boham, Bassett, Nebr., in place of F. C. Diehl, deceased.
Earl D. Ommert, Cambridge, Nebr., in place of W. E. Newcomb, transferred.
Joyce M. Bartu, Comstock, Nebr., in place of W. G. Hovie, transferred.
Thomas R. Carmin, Doniphan, Nebr., in place of I. G. Britt, retired.
Woodrow E. Grove, Edison, Nebr., in place of Austin Learned, retired.
Richard A. Donovan, Greeley, Nebr., in place of I. L. Barrett, retired.
Edward D. Dunn, Inavale, Nebr., in place of E. E. Harvey, resigned.
Robert L. Dowding, Seward, Nebr., in place of W. J. Johannes, retired.
Robert J. Behrns, Stromsburg, Nebr., in place of A. E. Rodine, retired.
Welton A. Juilfs, Talmadge, Nebr., in place of J. A. Graf, deceased.
Rex C. Heitman, Wallace, Nebr., in place of G. W. Pilkington, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Robert T. Logan, Boonton, N.J., in place of W. M. Ritchie, Jr., deceased.
Thomas S. Price, Eatontown, N.J., in place of F. E. Bruce, retired.
John J. Masterson, Garwood, N.J., in place of W. J. Binns, Jr., deceased.
William V. Heffernan, Jersey City, N.J., in place of W. P. Kern, retired.
John P. Granato, Jr., Madison, N.J., in place of R. P. Cosgrove, retired.
Edward Klimowich, Montville, N.J., in place of Floyd Smith, retired.
John L. Burke, Princeton Junction, N.J., in place of E. J. Hall, resigned.
Patricia A. Caul, Wallpack Center, N.J., in place of E. B. Rosenkrans, resigned.

NEW MEXICO

Howard W. Johnson, Eagle Nest, N. Mex., in place of A. L. Haddow, retired.

NEW YORK

Edward B. Bierman, Jr., East Syracuse, N.Y., in place of D. B. McLaughlin, retired.
William M. Supple, Elmira, N.Y., in place of G. R. Shepardon, retired.
Chester L. Phillips, Ferndale, N.Y., in place of T. N. Manion, retired.
Frank P. Fallica, Holtsville, N.Y., in place of F. A. Griffin, deceased.
Gerald E. Morrow, Maplecrest, N.Y., in place of B. W. Morrow, retired.
Robert G. Lind, Millerton, N.Y., in place of O. E. Velley, retired.
Lillian I. Hazen, Napanoch, N.Y., in place of R. T. Murphy, resigned.
James F. Ryan, Wadhams, N.Y., in place of L. L. Sherman, retired.

Thomas M. Murray, Warnerville, N.Y., in place of B. M. Barlow, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

William E. Derrick, Paw Creek, N.C., in place of M. R. McElroy, retired.
George W. Grayson, Spindale, N.C., in place of S. K. Yelton, retired.
Winfred F. White, Windsor, N.C., in place of O. A. Sutton, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Richard A. Mahin, Dawson, N. Dak., in place of E. A. Lewis, retired.

OHIO

Adam F. MacAdam, Crestline, Ohio, in place of T. O. Nelson, retired.
Darrell K. Anderson, Dellroy, Ohio, in place of F. W. Roof, transferred.
Bernard M. Turanchik, Pleasant City, Ohio, in place of H. F. Williams, retired.
Wallace L. Pealey, Zoarville, Ohio, in place of H. J. Stone, retired.

OKLAHOMA

George G. Murray, Jr., Colbert, Okla., in place of E. W. Clem, retired.
Atwood W. Chestnut, Elk City, Okla., in place of J. H. Smith, transferred.

PENNSYLVANIA

Dorald E. Clark, Breezewood, Pa., in place of L. H. Wilt, removed.
Hugo J. DeSolis, Devon, Pa., in place of J. F. Woodruff, transferred.
William F. Yohe, Fairless Hills, Pa., in place of C. B. Wright, retired.
Lloyd M. Rowe, Jr., Greencastle, Pa., in place of A. R. Brumbaugh, retired.
Glenn C. Barnhart, Little Meadows, Pa., in place of C. W. Lynch, retired.
James C. Basler, Mill Creek, Pa., in place of B. R. Faust, retired.
John K. Buffington, Punxsutawney, Pa., in place of T. R. Curry, retired.
Jennie S. Workman, Six Mile Run, Pa., in place of M. W. Workman, deceased.

PUERTO RICO

Atanasio Lugo, Bajadero, P.R., in place of Rufino Gomez, retired.

RHODE ISLAND

Arthur K. Payte, Charlestown, R.I., in place of H. K. Mook, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA

George A. Lemons, Lockhart, S.C., in place of J. V. Askew, Jr., deceased.
Fletcher C. Gause, Jr., Loris, S.C., in place of T. W. Boyd, retired.

TENNESSEE

Frank C. Moore, Chattanooga, Tenn., in place of O. M. Spence, removed.

TEXAS

Jefferson D. Collier, Cisco, Tex., in place of W. J. Foxworth, retired.
Homer R. Anderson, Forestburg, Tex., in place of R. L. Dunn, retired.
Norman G. Duren, Goldthwaite, Tex., in place of Lucile Fairman, deceased.
Douglas W. Meriwether, Lockney, Tex., in place of J. M. Griffith, retired.
Wade A. Majors, Jr., Turkey, Tex., in place of R. B. Gafford, transferred.

UTAH

John E. Jones, Vernal, Utah, in place of Orlo Goodrich, resigned.

VIRGINIA

Randall L. Marsh, Lancaster, Va., in place of M. I. Davenport, retired.
Mary F. Campbell, Piney River, Va., in place of A. C. Hilbish, retired.

WASHINGTON

George Knaus, Acme, Wash., in place of N. W. Rothenbuhler, retired.

WISCONSIN

Walter H. Reasa, Albany, Wis., in place of S. E. Conway, retired.
Kenneth L. Kunde, Sheboygan, Wis., in place of L. J. Albrecht, retired.

IN THE ARMY

Lt. Gen. Andrew Jackson Goodpaster, O21739, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army) for appointment as Senior United States Army Member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 711.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962.

To be general

Gen. Andrew Pick O'Meara, **XXXX**, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Lt. Gen. James Hilliard Polk, **XXXX**, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army) in the grade of general.

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Nels C. Johnson, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Harold G. Bowen, Jr., U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

IN THE MARINE CORPS RESERVE

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

Robert B. Bell

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Douglas J. Peacher

Charles T. Hagan, Jr.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of captain in the staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

*Baker, Robert L.	*McGreevy, John J.
*Buechel, Donald R.	*Olson, Marshall W.
*Christiansen, David V.	*Prescott, Eustace H., Jr.
*Drips, Robert C.	*Sanderlin, Joseph M.
*Dunn, Seldon C.	*Sigei, Carter B.
*Garrett, Robert I.	*Stephens, David L.
*Gaylor, Donald H.	*Youngman, Samuel A.
*Latham, Ernest F.	
*Maher, Robert W.	

SUPPLY CORPS

*Adrian, Rodger J.	Kamps, John H.
Allen, Paul M.	*Keidel, Charles J.
Barron, Willard D.	*Knight, Richard H.
Challain, Leonard J.	Kuhlman, Norman H.
Chapman, Edgar C., Jr.	C.
*Clements, Daniel J., Jr.	Laplante, Robert W.
Condon, Thomas P.	*Larson, Albert G.
Creekman, Charles T.	*Lewis, William L.
Davis, Albert S.	*MacDonald, Albert P., Jr.
*Dellasega, Joseph L.	Mercadante, James A.
Fisher, Robert D.	Moore, Alvin
Hay, Patrick M.	Nichols, Horace E.
Hein, Joseph J., Jr.	Potts, Stanley W.
Heurich, Robert G.	*Randolph, Karl W.
Irwin, Harry E.	*Small, Joseph T.
*Jones, Joe L.	*Stafford, Dean C., Jr.
	*Surran, Charles R.

*Thurman, Horace E.	Whelan, David W. Jr.
*Walther, Frederick W.	*Woolard, Kenneth A.
Wehrich, Walter F.	Xeferis, Zeffer C.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

*Bonner, Robert A.	Maguire, Connell J.
*Cloonan, Joseph F.	*Vincer, John D.
Fitzpatrick, Francis J. N.	Zoller, John E.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Allen, Max H.	*Griffiths, William H., Jr.
*Ashley, Donn L.	Hill, James M., Jr.
*Baker, Carlyle J., Jr.	Magnuson, Norman J.
Briggs, Fred M.	*Mitter, Wayne S.
Burfield, James A.	Paul, Edwin C.
*Devlin, John G.	Powell, Joseph E.
Fisher, John R.	*Sturman, William H.
Goetzke, George A., Jr.	Walls, Worthen A.

DENTAL CORPS

*Bartlett, Stephen O.	*Kramer, Howard S., Jr.
*Delaurentis, Carlo A.	Jr.
*Didion, Robert W.	*Lehmann, William G.
*Echols, Archie D., Jr.	*Wortham, Maury E.
*Gregory, Worth B., Jr.	

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

*Caldwell, Charlie C.	Joslin, Leslie H.
*Claus, Edward L.	*Mason, Anderson T.
*Coggburn, Manfred W.	*Mayberry, Frank L.
*Combs, Harrison T.	McMillin, Charles R.
Conaway, Theodore H., Jr.	*Moeller, Ruth
Cumming, William G., Jr.	*Moore, Daniel D.
*Elsman, Leon P.	*Smith, Orville E.
*Essman, Frederick B.	*Teller, Leslie W., Jr.
*Fennell, Chester C.	*Tennille, Robert M., Jr.
*Hull, William B.	*VonRadesky, Horace
Hunter, Russell E.	Ware, Robert M.
	*Young, John L.

NURSE CORPS

*Houp, Geraldine A.

The following-named officers of the United States Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of commander in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Abercrombie, Jerry T.	Barth, Joseph J., Jr.
*Adair, Frederick S.	*Bassett, Jerry S.
Addams, John F.	*Bath, Alan H.
Ahlquist, Stanley W.	*Bathurst, Robert B.
Albertson, William H.	Baum, Joseph H.
Alexander, Marvin W.	Beaumont, Eugene A. G.
Allredge, Donald L.	Beaver, Alfred S.
*Allen, Winfred P.	*Beavers, Roy L., Jr.
Allison, Arnold W.	Beck, Donald A.
Altmeier, John M.	Behnken, Clifford R.
*Anaston, Tommy K., Jr.	Bekkedahl, Clifford L.
*Anderson, Alden B.	*Bell, Clyde R.
*Anderson, Duane E.	*Belton, Jack G.
*Anthony, David J.	*Bender, Albert F., Jr.
Apted, George L.	*Beneto, Manuel A., Jr.
Archambault, Jackson L.	Bennie, Donald B.
*Arnel, Lyle O., II	Bentley, William C.
Asbacher, Martin A., Jr.	Berge, Norman K.
Ashley, Bruce H.	*Berger, James K.
Babcock, Donald E.	*Bergesen, Andrew J.
*Baciocco, Albert J., Jr.	*Berglund, Lester W., Jr.
*Backes, Ronald J.	*Berry, George H., Jr.
*Bademan, Harold W.	*Berry, Joel H., Jr.
*Bahm, John J.	Berry, William H.
*Bailey, George T.	Bird, Charles F.
Baker, Robert O.	Bivens, Arthur C.
Balderston, Buele G.	*Blackadar, Paul F.
Ball, Courtland D., III	*Blackington, Richard N.
*Banks, Bruce R.	*Blackwood, Jack D.
Banks, Sidney M.	Blackwood, Robert G.
*Banks, William E., IV	Blandine, Robert E.
*Barnes, John B.	*Blanding, Robert L.
Baron, Charles R.	*Blaney, William C., Jr.
*Barrett, Roy F.	*Blaszczak, Walter J.
*Barringer, Malcolm L.	Block, Stanley H.
Barry, Thomas M.	

*Bohannon, William L.	*Cotten, Thomas R., Jr.
*Booth, Roger G.	*Cotter, Charles L.
Borthwick, Robert B.	Coughlin, Paul G.
*Botsko, Ronald T.	*Crain, James D.
*Bowers, Henry H.	*Crane, Leonard B., Jr.
Bowling, David H.	Crater, Ray F.
Boyd, John H., Jr.	Crinklaw, Douglas L.
Boyer, Walton T., Jr.	*Cronin, Francis W.
Boyle, Darrell D.	*Cruden, David S.
Braden, Melvin E., Jr.	Cunningham, Edward F.
*Brady, John H., Jr.	Curl, Kent W.
Breaux, Fred J., Jr.	*Curran, Robert W.
Bredestege, Joseph J., Jr.	Curry, Thomas E.
*Bridge, James A., Jr.	*Cush, Casimo J.
*Bristol, Robert B.	*Cywin, Lawrence
*Brown, Donald N.	*Dalton, Charles W.
*Brown, George W.	*Daniels, Verlyne W.
*Brown, Jacob C.	*Dapogny, Robert J.
Brown, Larry J.	*Davidson, Charles H.
*Brown, Robert M.	*Davis, Noble J., Jr.
Brown, Walter H., Jr.	*Davis, Walter J.
Browning, Siras D.	*Davison, David D.
*Brownley, John H.	*Day, Arthur R.
Bruce, George W., Jr.	*Dearman, Kermit E.
*Bruner, James R.	*Denbigh, Robert S., Jr.
*Bruning, Richard A.	Denman, Charles C., Jr.
Brunskill, Robert J.	*Denton, David N.
Brunson, Wright A., Jr.	Detonnancourt, Arthur E.
*Buchanan, Alvin J., Jr.	*Dewispelaere, Earl L.
*Buck, Donald D.	Dick, Joseph L.
*Buckholts, Walter H., Jr.	Digiacomo, Joseph G.
*Burnett, John H.	Dimon, Charles G., Jr.
*Burris, John R.	*Dion, Laurent N.
*Bush, James T.	*Dobyns, John E.
Butler, Charles T.	*Doelling, Robert D.
Butryn, Stanley B., Jr.	Donaldson, Robert S.
Byrnes, Robert E.	Donnelly, Raymond D.
*Cagney, Thomas P.	Donovan, James F.
*Calkins, Donald L.	Doolittle, James E.
*Cameron, Kenneth R.	Doroshuk, John, Jr.
*Cameron, Norman A.	Douglas, Jack R.
*Campbell, John A.	Dowd, George G., Jr.
Campbell, James B.	*Dowds, Donald H.
*Cann, Tedford J.	Dowe, Robert M., Jr.
Canon, George A., III	*Dowse, Herbert B., Jr.
*Cantacuzene, Rodion	Drew, Russell C.
Carelli, Francis L.	Drummond, Scott E., Jr.
*Carlin, Robert J.	*Duckett, Philip V. L.
*Carlisle, David R.	*Dudley, Paul L., Jr.
*Carlson, Ronald F.	Dunaway, John A., Jr.
Carosia, Joseph J.	Duncan, Dale W.
Carr, John H.	Dunkin, Ray L.
*Carson, Ernest H.	Dunlop, Thomas E.
*Carson, Ralph	*Dyer, George T., Jr.
Carterette, Robert T.	*Dykens, Thomas M., Jr.
*Case, George P., Jr.	Eckhouse, Morton A.
Cash, Eugene J.	*Eddy, William P., III
Cassidy, Thomas J., Jr.	Edwards, Jerry J.
*Caulk, Robert F.	Edwards, William R., Jr.
*Chadwick, John R.	*Eggert, Lowell F.
*Charest, Alexis N.	*Ellis, George D., Jr.
*Chesky, James A.	Elster, James M.
*Chinn, Clarence E.	*Emerson, Jesse R., III
*Christensen, Eugene J.	Englander, Owen
Christensen, Raymond J.	Erwin, Donald E.
*Christon, Paul W.	*Evans, Thomas B.
*Clark, Lynn R.	*Ewy, Howard W.
*Clark, Stanley D.	*Faessel, Matthew W.
*Clarke, Robert R.	Falconer, Alastair S.
*Clarke, Walter L., Jr.	*Fall, David R., Jr.
Clements, Billy R.	Farber, Karl H.
Cloughley, William D.	Farnham, Charles G.
*Cockell, William A., Jr.	Feeks, Edmond M.
Coe, David C., Jr.	*Fellingham, Robert W.
Coleman, James O.	*Fellowes, Frederick G., Jr.
*Colligan, Thomas R.	Felt, Donald L.
Collins, Philip K.	Fenn, Dan E.
Cook, Charles L.	*Ferguson, Andrew C.
*Cooke, Robert A.	Ferguson, Ernest W.
*Cooper, Donald H.	*Fernandes, James E.
Cooper, Tommy G.	*Fink, Edward R.
Corbett, Eugene A.	
Coskey, Kenneth L.	
Coston, Stanford W., Jr.	

- *Finney, Jack L.
Fischbein, Ernest
Fischer, David H.
Fischer, Edward J.
*Fisher, William G., Jr.
*Fitts, Jean M.
*Fleeson, Richard J.
*Fletcher, Richard M.
*Foley, Edmund F.
Fong, Chong S.
*Ford, Leon E., Jr.
*Foy, Edward W.
Fraser, Robert E.
Freeman, Linus W., Jr.
Freeman, Robert W.
*French, William L.
Frick, Joseph F.
*Friesse, George A.
Friesen, Floyd A.
*Frost, John F., III
Furmanski, John A.
Gall, Daune M.
Gardner, Ruel E.
Garrett, John E.
*Gaskin, Richard G.
*Gatwood, Tommy L.
*Gauthier, John O.
Gavazzi, Robert R.
Gennette, Robert L.
Gildea, Joseph A.
*Gillan, Martin J., III
Giovannetti, William C.
Glaves, Robert H.
Glazier, Alvin S.
*Godfrey, Forrest J.
*Golde, Morton
Goldner, Robert R.
Good, Ronald P.
Gooden, Richard O.
*Goodfellow, John
Goodman, Kelsey B.
Gordon, Richard F., Jr.
Gowing, Richard M.
*Graffam, Earl H.
*Gray, Harvey, Jr.
*Gray, Walter S., III
Greeley, Michael T.
*Green, William C.
Greer, Wayne C.
Gregory, George B.
Grich, Richard J.
Griggs, Norman E.
*Groder, Robert E.
*Groehn, Gerhard C.
*Groenert, Frederick E.
*Grosshuesch, David K.
*Gunn, William J.
*Guyer, Robert A.
Hackney, Benjamin F., III
Hairston, Thomas F.
Halverson, Richard K.
Hamel, James K.
Hamilton, Glenn D.
*Hamilton, Leroy A.
Hammock, John W.
*Hamrick, Thomas D.
*Handford, Richard C.
*Hannegan, Frank N.
Hannula, Brian K.
Hansard, Stonewall
*Hansen, Norman T.
Hansen, Rodney V.
*Hantz, Francis A.
Harns, John H.
*Harp, Robert M.
*Harris, James W.
Harris, Richard A.
*Harrop, Robert D.
*Hartley, Jack H.
*Hawkins, Richard M.
Hays, Estel W.
*Headley, Allen B.
*Heath, Frederick T.
*Hedberg, Arthur J., Jr.
Helgemoe, Raymond A.
*Helgeson, Warren A.
- *Helland, Gerald H.
Helms, Harlie B., Jr.
*Helms, Ronald L.
Henson, John M.
*Herring, Edwin L.
*Hess, Adolph W., Jr.
*Hickman, William J.
Higgins, Byron R.
*Hilder, Frederick A.
*Hill, Lucio W.
*Hinkley, Harold L.
*Hipp, Ronald N., Jr.
*Hipple, William J.
Hoch, John E., Jr.
*Hodges, James W., Jr.
Hodson, Theodore L., Jr.
*Hoffman, Robert B.
Holbert, William H., Jr.
Holcomb, "M" Staser
*Holgren, Marvin A.
Hollan, James J.
*Holland, Elbert R.
*Hollandsworth, Roy M.
*Hollen, Frederick M.
*Holloway, Floyd, Jr.
*Hoover, John S.
Horan, Robert A.
Hoskovec, William B.
House, Edward C.
Houston, Albert W.
Howard, Albert W., Jr.
*Howey, Robert E.
Hubbard, Samuel W., Jr.
Hughes, Kenneth P.
Hukill, Henry D., Jr.
Humber, Marcel B.
Humphreys, Felton M., Jr.
*Hunter, Herbert P.
Hurley, Robert J.
*Hyde, Robert A.
Ingraham, Talcott L., Jr.
Isaacks, Marion H.
*Jackson, Dempster M.
Jacobs, Edward J.
Jacobs, Edward J., Jr.
*James, Charlie N., Jr.
Jasper, Charles R.
*Jaycox, Randall E., Jr.
Johnsen, Roy M.
Johnson, Arne C.
*Johnson, Frederick C.
*Johnson, George M.
*Johnson, Oren D.
*Johnson, Philip E.
*Johnston, George T.
Jones, Donald W.
Jones, Donald S.
*Jones, Richard H.
*Jones, Robert C.
*Josephson, Henning C.
Kane, Charles K.
Kane, Paul E.
Karpatis, Anthony J.
Kattmann, Roger H.
*Keefe, Thomas J., Jr.
Keimig, Allen D., Jr.
Kelly, James F.
*Kelly, John S.
*Kelt, William N.
Kemble, Richard E.
Kendrick, William O.
Kennedy, William E.
*Kershaw, Daniel J.
*Kilduff, Paul E.
*Kim, Alfred H. S., Jr.
*Kimzey, Walter F.
Kinsley, Harry W., Jr.
*Kirby, Albert D.
Kirksey, Robert E.
*Knight, Charles H.
Kniss, Donovan E.
*Koehne, Richard J.
*Kosmela, Walter T.
*Kraft, Frederick W.
- Kratz, Marshall L.
Kretzschmann, Curt H.
*Kuder, Dalton L.
*Kugler, Kenneth D.
*Kuncas, John W.
Kunstmann, Clarence M.
*Kunze, Martin W.
Kurzenhauser, Alfred
*Lacy, Joe R.
Lafferty, Jerry D.
Lage, Robert L.
Lake, Walter W.
*Lamm, William A.
Lange, Kenneth B.
*Langford, John M.
*Larkins, Burton J.
Larsen, John H.
Lashbrook, Durwood E.
Latham, William B.
Latta, Robert L.
*Laux, William J., Jr.
Lavender, Robert E.
*Lavin, Charles V.
Lawler, William A.
*Leblanc, Georges E., Jr.
*Lemmon, Virgil J.
Lenahan, Robert P.
Levenson, Lee E.
*Leverone, Robert M.
Levey, Sanford N.
*Lewis, Harold M. J., Jr.
*Lewis, Robert
*Lichlyter, Stanford E.
Lightsey, Elvin G., Jr.
Limbaugh, Harold D.
Limerick, Christopher J., Jr.
Lloyd, Theodore L., Jr.
*Locke, Walter M.
*Lodge, Billups E.
*Loggan, Wilfred J.
Lohr, Chester H.
Longman, Richard D.
*Lumsden, Richard E.
Lynch, William A.
Lyon, Peter W.
*Lyons, James A., Jr.
*Lyons, Thomas W., Jr.
*Macpherson, John J.
Mahony, Wilbur J.
*Malaney, Robert E.
Mallory, John S.
*Malone, Thomas L., Jr.
*Maloney, Peter M.
*Mandel, Cornelius E., Jr.
*Manduca, Theodore W.
Mangin, Joseph N., III
Mann, Horace D., Jr.
*Marshall, Robert M.
Martin, Alan F.
Martin, Robert C.
*Martin, Tyrone G.
Mathews, Robert D.
Mathews, Thomas H.
*Mathis, Thomas R.
*Mattson, Donald J.
Mauldin, Richard A.
Mayberry, Thomas A., Jr.
McAlevey, John H.
McCanna, Marvin G., Jr.
*McCardell, James E., Jr.
*McCollum, Arthur H., Jr.
McConnell, Donald L.
*McCoy, Roy E.
*McCune, Joe D.
McDonald, Raymond T.
McGathy, Charles L., Jr.
McGrath, William D.
- *McGuire, Orville W.
*McHugh, James J.
McKay, John H.
*McKee, Robert X.
McLuckie, James D.
McMurtry, Robert A., Jr.
*McNett, William T.
*McPadden, Donald F. X.
McVay, Donald H., Jr.
*McWilliam, John R.
*Meacham, Arthur J.
*Meacham, James A.
*Melim, Robert D.
*Messer, Jarvis N.
*Metcalf, Louis E., Jr.
Metzler, Donald M.
Miale, Robert E.
Milano, Vito R.
Miller, Blount R., Jr.
Miller, Curtis W., Jr.
*Miller, John R.
*Miller, Richard J.
*Mills, Merle E.
Mitchell, Carroll K.
Mitchell, Joseph S.
Mitchell, Robert C.
Mock, Roy L.
Monroe, Edward H., Jr.
*Montgomery, Stephen C.
Moore, Clarence E.
*Moore, Rufus J.
Moran, Clifford D.
Moreau, Arthur S., Jr.
Morford, Dean R.
Morgan, Houston M.
*Morgan, James E.
Morgan, Leroy W., Jr.
Morin, Ronald D.
*Morris, Henry C., Jr.
Moss, Daniel J.
*Mounce, Claude E.
Moury, Roger F.
Muench, Gerald W.
*Mullane, Thomas F.
*Mulloy, Paul J.
Murdoch, Alan G.
*Murray, Joseph E., Jr.
Myers, Coleman E.
*Nelson, James M.
*Nelson, Leroy C.
Newcomb, James A.
Newman, Robert L.
Nichols, Richard L.
*Niedbala, Thomas F.
*Nordtvedt, Ernest R.
*North, Dean B.
*Numbers, Earl W.
*Nutter, Andrew T. J.
*O'Brien, Austin C., Jr.
*O'Connell, John F.
*O'Connell John D.
*O'Connor, John E.
*O'Connor, Joseph E.
*Oder, Howard W.
*Ogle, William J.
*O'Keefe, James L., Jr.
*Oldham, Albert W.
Olds, Robert B.
*Olson, Harold L.
Olson, Norman H.
*Olson, Richard S.
*O'Neil, Louis C., Jr.
Onorato, Ernest D.
Orell, Quinlan R.
*O'Rourke, Bernard J.
*Orrik, Frederick J., Jr.
*Ortega, Joseph J.
Osborne, Arthur M.
Osborne, Charles N.
*O'Shea, John A., Jr.
*Oster, John S.
*Paddock, Charles O.
Padgett, Harry E.
Palmieri, John J.
Parcher, Stuart M.
*Parkhurst, David C.
- Passantino, Sebastian P.
*Pattee, Arthur W.
*Paul, David L.
*Paul, John E.
*Payne, Douglas W.
*Peele, Morris A.
*Perrault, Mark E.
Perry, Lowell E.
*Perry, Timothy J.
*Perry, William N.
*Peters, Paul F.
Peterson, John W.
Peterson, Richard N.
Petry, William A.
*Phillips, Robert A.
*Pierce, Ray E.
*Ping, Vernon S., Jr.
*Platt, Grafton S.
*Pohll, Richard R.
*Poling, William E.
Pollum, Edgar W.
*Pope, Daniel K., IV
*Porter, Thomas
*Post, Robert E., Jr.
*Potter, William W.
*Powell, George W.
*Preble, Russell A., Jr.
*Preston, Edgar H.
Price, Walter P.
Priddy, Clarence L., Jr.
Pringe, Donald B.
Pritscher, Robert L.
Profflet, Clarence J.
Purdum, William H.
*Purvis, Elvis E.
*Quartararo, Michael A.
*Quick, Jay E.
Quirk, William J.
*Ramsey, Gayle
*Ramsey, William E.
*Randolph, Joseph L.
*Rapkin, Jerome
*Rasmussen, Robert L.
*Ray, Glen P.
Reed, Charles A.
*Reeder, Ralph J.
Reeg, Frederick J.
*Reger, William L.
Remsen, "T" Schenck
*Reynolds, Robert F., Jr.
*Rhodes, John P.
Rhodes, Randolph L.
*Rice, Stanley G.
*Rich, Richard
*Richard, Jackson B.
*Ricks, Robert R.
*Rieken, Richard G.
Riley, Raymond T.
Ritz, Merlin C.
Roach, Francis L.
*Robinson, Kirby L.
*Rochford, John M.
*Rodda, John D.
Rodgers, Dean T.
*Rodgers, Frederick A.
*Rodgers, Harvey P.
Rodgers, Thomas A.
*Rollins, James J.
Rorie, Conrad J.
Rose, William R.
*Rowden, William H.
Ruhseberger, Roger H.
Rusch, John M.
Russ, William A.
Ryan, James A., Jr.
Ryan, Thomas J.
*Sacks, Harold H.
*Salomon, Ferdinand L.
Sanden, Oscar E., Jr.
Sanders, Ben T.
Sargent, Richard E.
*Saunders, Thomas J.
*Sayer, William D.
*Scalese, Anthony C., Jr.
Schaaf, Thomas W.
*Schaub, John R., Jr.
- *Schluter, Hugo E.
*Schroeder, Robert E.
*Schulze, Robert H.
*Schurr, Thomas P.
Schwartz, Wallace J.
*Scott, Edward T.
Scott, Kenneth M.
Sebring, Leland H.
*Self, David L.
Semple, William C., III
Sesow, Anthony D.
Shafer, William J. E.
*Shaffer, George W.
*Shanahan, William F.
Shaw, John H.
Shaw, John G.
Sheehy, Eugene E.
*Sheets, Roger E.
*Shepherd, David C.
*Sherman, John W.
Shilling, John D.
Shine, Maurice J.
Simmons, Clayton M.
*Simms, James T., Jr.
*Simons, Donald W.
*Siska, Edward
*Skillman, Charles F.
Slawson, Ralph L.
Smevow, Herbert W.
*Smiley, Douglas I.
*Smith, Clifford R.
Smith, Frederick D., Jr.
*Smith, James R.
Smith, James H.
*Smith, John V.
Smith, Morgan H.
*Smith, Paul J., Jr.
*Smith, Richard C.
*Smith, St. Clair
*Smith, William F.
*Smutter, Clarence H.
*Smoot, William N.
*Snyder, Fred D.
*Snyder, Herbert J. V.
*Snyder, James M.
*Snyder, Ned C.
*Sothan, Norman L.
*Sowinski, Stanislaus J.
Spar, Edwin F.
Spartz, John N.
Speelman, Thomas W.
*Spencer, Harry A., Jr.
*Sperling, David J.
Spradley, Van E.
Stafford, Kenneth B.
*Stanley, Edward E.
Stanley, Thomas A.
*Staple, David F.
*Steckbeck, Francis J.
*Stein, Norman F.
Steinke, Harris E.
Stevens, Jack D.
*Stewart, David H.
Stewart, Douglas A.
*Stone, James M.
*Story, Warren L.
*Sudduth, Roger M.
*Sugg, Ross E.
*Sullivan, Edward T.
*Sullivan, Walter F.
Sullivan, William W.
Sutherland, Doyle L.
*Swartztrauber, Sayre A.
*Sweet, William J.
Sykes, Lewis B.
Talbot, James R., Jr.
Tally, Billy F.
Taylor, Thomas H.
Terry, Daniel G. W.
*Tetreault, Paul J.
Thomas, Donald P. R., Jr.
*Thompson, Arthur R., Jr.
*Thompson, Clifford E.

Thompson, George I.
Thonneson, Earling R.
Throop, James R.
Till, Ernest A.
Traweck, Billy B.
Trueblood, William E.
Turk, Herman L.
Turner, Sherman W.
Tuszynski, Raymond S.
Tuttle, John R.
Umberger, Robert C.
Vanhossen, David A.
Vanvalkenburg, George B.
Vanwestendorp, Steven
Varner, Duane L.
Varney, Jack E.
Veach, Clarence E.
Voegelein, Gordon R.
Wagner, David F.
Wagner, James W.
Waite, Charles E.
Wakeman, Curtiss O.
Walczak, Norbert F.
Walden, John W.
Walker, George D.
Walker, Henry M.
Walker, Peter B.
Walker, William B.
Wallace, Cedric S.
Wallace, Thomas M.
Walling, Eugene K.
Walls, Richard B.
Walshe, Edward C., Jr.
Walters, James V.
Wanamaker, John F.
Ward, Conley R.
Ward, Robert B.
Warner, Lorraine B.
Warren, Billy R.
Warren, Thomas C.
Warren, Tommy H., Jr.
Warthen, Donald
Wasson, John E.
Watts, Charles R., Jr.
Weaver, James J.
Weaver, John H.
Webb, James I.
Webster, James M.
Weedon, Robert E.
Weeks, Alan L.
Weeks, George H.
Weimerskirch, John R.

MEDICAL CORPS

*Ahtye, Perry
*Aiken, Robert J.
*Baer, Henry A.
*Baker, John H.
*Baker, Robert F.
*Balas, George I.
*Boop, Warren C., Jr.
*Bornmann, Robert C.
*Bouterie, Ronald L.
*Braswell, Harold M., Jr.
*Bristow, William M.
*Brothers, William S.
*Burningham, Richard A.
*Burr, John B.
*Chappelka, Alfred R., Jr.
*Colgrove, Robert C.
*Cremona, Frederick J.
*Cross, Gregory H.
*Curtis, John W.
*Damato, Nicholas A.
*Davis, John W.
*Davis, Richard L.
*Defebvre, Brace K., Jr.
*Deluca, Hugo S.
*Dolan, Michael F.
*Donnell, Garrett E.
*Edson, Mitchell

Weishar, Charles F.
Weissman, Marvin M.
Wellings, John F.
Wells, Don V.
*Wells, Eugene R., Jr.
*Wells, Lawrence H.
*Wenker, William A.
*Wessman, Robert L.
*West, Gordon R.
*Westphal, Lloyd M., Jr.
*Wetmore, Horace O., Jr.
*White, John E.
*White, Richard E.
*Whitley, Clyde T.
*Wildner, William E.
*Wiley, Kenneth R.
*Willenbrink, James F.
*Williams, Douglas A.
*Williams, James G., III
*Williams, James B.
*Williams, Ralph T.
*Williamson, Paul W.
*Williamson, Robert L.
*Williamson, Harry H., Jr.
*Wilson, Edward W.
*Wilson, Jack L.
*Wilson, James E., Jr.
*Wilson, Samuel B.
*Wilson, Vaughn E., Jr.
*Winfree, Herman D., Jr.
*Winters, Charles A.
*Wisdom, Jessie R.
*Wise, Peyton R., II
*Wiseman, Charles H.
*Wiseman, Hobart J.
*Withers, Christopher
*Wittrock, Henry L.
*Wolff, William M., Jr.
*Wood, Thomas H.
*Woodburn, Craig E.
*Woodyard, Jon C.
*Woolway, James E.
*Wright, Richard T.
*Wright, Sidney V., Jr.
*Wright, William F.
*Wunsch, John R.
*Wyatt, William C., III
*Wynn, Carl E., Jr.
*Yanaros, John O.
*Yoder, Dwane F.
*Young, Alfred A., III
*Zastrow, Robert R.
*Zitani, Genius A.

*Mortensen, Norval
*Mucha, Stephen J.
*Mukomela, Arthur E.
Myers, Joseph S.
*Narva, William M.
*Nickerson, Charles W.
*Nieves, Miguel, Jr.
*O'Neill, James F.
*Potvin, Louis E.
*Raasch, Frank O., Jr.
*Ralston, John C., Jr.
*Rehme, Arthur L.
*Reid, Donald
*Rice, Bruce H.
*Ryskamp, James J., Jr.
Sacks, Ellsworth J., Jr.

SUPPLY CORPS

*Adair, Joseph P.
Allinder, Joe A., Jr.
Bates, Robert L.
Brown, Russell M.
Brunson, Robert L.
Buckman, Robert S.
Caliman, Wayman G., Jr.
Carpenter, Charles F., Sr.
*Carpenter, Norman E.
*Catanach, Anthony
Christopher, Robert N.
*Conrad, Stanley J.
Corn, James R.
*Curtin, Pat
Curtis, Richard E.
*Cuson Charles E.
*Davidson, William I.
Dempster, Darrell D.
*Derby, Francis A.
Donzell, Richard J.
*Drabek, Stephen J.
Earl, Robert J.
*Eckert, George H., Jr.
*Felthousen, Charles E.
Floild, Robert E.
Flores, Joseph L.
*Francisco, Dick H.
*French, Robert C.
*French, Robert T.
Garabedian, Edward J.
Gilmore, Roger W.
Girod, Roy O.
*Goslin, Thomas C., Jr.
Gunther, Roy W.
*Hamilton, Thomas, Jr.
*Hamilton, Walter S.
Henry, Gerald R.
Hoggood, Roy E.
Howe, Donald K., Jr.
Hubbard, Charles C.
*Kelly, Robert C.
*Kenealy, William E., Jr.
King, Braxton R.
Knox, Arthur F., Jr.
Kollios, Achilleas E.
Kreutzinger, Donald R.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Andress, Gene B.
*Auel, Carl A.
*Baker, Marvin D.
*Beck, John T.
Begg, Wendell R.
*Boreczky, John V.
*Clifford, William J.
Dodson, Leonard W., Jr.
*Geeza, Boris
Gillis, Edward F.
*Goad, John T.
*Jensen, Andrew F., Jr.
*Kensta, Felix L.
*Moser, Robert W.
*Murphy, Milton G.

Seeley, Richard J.
*Segaul, Arthur I.
*Sell, Kenneth W.
*Senn, Francis E., Jr.
*Sierchio, Gerald P.
*Stahl, Charles J., III
*Stenger, John R.
*Stormo, Alan C.
Theros, Elias, P. G.
*Townsend, Guy B.
*Walker, Robert E.
*Wentworth, Alan F.
*Wilhelm, Harry W.
*Wood, Joseph H., Jr.
*York, Ellihu
York, Lowell T.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Allen Roy L.
*Belton, Edward H.
*Biederman, Richard J.
Borberg, James R.
Bowers, Richard A.
*Calhoun, Charles W.
Crowley, Irwin D., Jr.
Doyle, Thomas J.
Erickson, James A.
Falk, Harvey A., Jr.
Gates, Charles W.
*Geoly, Charles
Houghton, Robert J.
Hughes, Edmund C.
Keegan, Robert D.
Lapolla, Joseph
Lawson, Leroy D.
Mathews, Charles J.

DENTAL CORPS

*Baker, Ronald D.
*Barbor, Gerald L.
*Billotte, Alfred C.
*Bodine, Theodore A., Jr.
*Brown, Kenneth E.
*Coombs, Paul S.
Cunningham, Charles J.
*Davidson, Richard S.
*Duncan, Donald E.
*Eichel, Frederick P.
*Garver, Don G.
Gibson, William V., Jr.
Hayes, Daniel E.
*Herr, Albert
*King, Gordon E.
*Klima, James E.
*Little, Richard W.
Loo, Wallace D.
*Mainous, Eugene G.
Martin, William R.
*McDonald, Edwin E., Jr.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Arns, William E.
*Asche, Clifton A.
Becker, David E.
*Bennett, Paul P., Jr.
*Bower, Harold R.
*Buckley, Emanuel N.
*Campbell, Howard B.
*Chansky, Ralph D.
*Dean, Jerdon J.
*Elmore, Milford D.
George, Robert E.
*Gill, Robert L.
*Goding, Hubert M.
*Guinn, John W.
*Gutekunst, Richard R.
Howard, John E.
*Irvin, Ernest J.
*Jones, Earmon R., Jr.
*Jones, Philip E.
*Jordan, Charles J.

NURSE CORPS

*Boring, Martha L.
Corcoran, Anna
*Hall, Lucy E.
Hill, Gretchen S.
Job, Lucy A.
McKay, Bernadette A.
Murasheff, Lina D.
Nielubowicz, Mary J.
Osborne, Leah V.
Osborne, Leah G.
Pence, Edith A.
Redgate, Janet M.
*Roller, Helen
*Searcy, Owedia M.
*Taylor, Anna S.
*Tyler, Mary R.
*Zabel, Kathryn E.

The following named officers of the United States Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

*Achor, Earl W.
*Ackart, Leon E.
Adams, Douglas N.
Adams, John W.
*Adkins, James N., Jr.
*Adkins, William, Jr.
Adler, Roy W.
*Aiello, Robert J.
*Ainsworth, Gerald I.
*Akers, Max N.
*Akin, Hurston B.

- *Albright, Donald W.
Albright, John D.
*Albritton, Hugh H., Jr.
*Alden, Robert F.
*Alexander, Hershel D.
Alexander, Richard K.
Alexander, John R.
Alexander, Dawson, Jr.
Alkire, James C.
Allender, George R.
*Allman, John I., III
*Allsopp, Richard E.
Alvarez, Marcos I.
*Alvarez, Raoul
*Ambrogio, John F., Jr.
*Amendt, Lester D.
Amick, Carl W.
*Ammons, Clarence M.
*Anderson, George E.
*Anderson, John W.
*Anderson, Richard S., Jr.
*Apap, Antonio
Arata, William A., III
*Armbruster, Robert B.
*Arnold, Edward F.
*Artim, Ronald N.
Astorino, Gerald P.
*Atkins, Thomas M.
Atwell, Marion A.
*Auclair, Leonard L.
*Ault, Russell S.
Ayars, James E.
*Babb, Richard L.
Bacon, Roger F.
*Bailey, Richard C.
Baker, Charles H., Jr.
Baker, Edward B., Jr.
*Baker, Eldon S.
*Baker, Joffre P.
*Balcom, Robert E.
*Baldwin, Edwin M.
Ballard, Ronald H.
*Banta, Clifton E., III
*Barnette, George W., III
*Barrier, Lee E.
*Barron, Douglas W.
Barry, Thomas J.
*Bartels, Harlan B.
Bartels, Malcolm G.
Bartholomew, Thomas C.
*Bass, Robert L.
*Bassett, Charles H., Jr.
Bassett, Frank E.
*Batterby, Robert E.
Bayne, James L.
*Beamer, Barton D.
*Beard, Percy M., Jr.
*Beasley, Edwin L.
Beatty, John R.
*Becker, James G.
*Beil, David A.
*Belcher, Job O., Jr.
Belcher, Samuel A., III
Bellay, Daniel J.
*Bender, Wayne C.
*Bennett, Arthur T.
*Bennett, David G.
Berg, Robert P.
Berg, Roger L.
*Bergondy, Paul J.
Bernet, Karl R.
Bernsen, Harold J.
*Bertelsen, Ralph I.
*Besecker, John A.
*Biggs, Gene E.
*Binard, Donald C.
*Bird, John P.
*Bishop, Benjamin M.
Bishop, Jack D.
Blitoff, John W.
Blackburn, Harry L., Jr.
- Blackstone, David L.
*Blackwell, Michael J.
Blair, Frederick E.
*Blakeslee, Dean T.
Blatchley, Robert D.
*Blatt, Russel N.
*Bledsoe, Paul I.
*Bliss, Donald E.
*Bliss, John R.
Block, Thomas R.
*Bloedorn, James J.
*Bloh, William C.
*Boatright, Jimmie R.
*Bolwerk, James M.
*Bonadies, Louis
*Booriakin, Walter A.
*Borick, David E.
Borden, Edward L.
*Boswell, Edward B.
Bott, Melvin C.
*Bouchard, Henry J.
*Bouchard, Joseph S.
Bough, Bennie E.
*Bouton, Samuel L.
Bovey, Robert L.
*Bovill, Donald J.
*Bower, Gordon I.
Bowles, Howard A., Jr.
*Bowman, Andrew L.
*Bowser, Paul G.
*Boxwell, William R.
Boyd, James P., Jr.
*Boyd, Rudolph C.
*Boyle, Francis C.
*Boyle, Ronald A.
*Boyster, Arnold E.
*Bradbury, Craig M.
*Bradfield, James D.
*Bradley, Carlton S.
*Brady, James E.
*Brainard, Hubert E.
Branch, Lyle F.
Brantuas, Joseph A.
Breast, Jerry C.
*Brendenstein, John F.
Brennan, John J.
*Brennock, Robert F.
*Brickell, Charles H., Jr.
*Brickner, John S.
Bridgman, Walter E., Jr.
*Brightman, James M.
Brining, George
*Brink, Charles W.
Brock, Virgil E.
*Brodersen, Henry H.
*Bromberg, Bruce L.
Brooks, Paul E.
*Brown, Albert H.
*Brown, Donald R.
*Brown, Dorsey A.
Brown, Frank H.
*Brown, John W.
*Brown, Kenneth C.
*Brown, Lawrence
*Brown, Paul L.
*Brown, Randolph M.
*Brown, Russell G.
*Brown, Thomas W.
*Browne, Thomas M.
*Brownell, Paul E.
*Brune, Charles M.
Brunner, Danny J.
*Bryant, Dennis N.
*Buckner, Gerald G.
*Buechel, Joseph L.
*Buell, Thomas B.
Buerger, Newton W., Jr.
*Buhler, Conrad A.
*Bullard, Lewis D.
*Bullington, Jack F.
*Bunting, Keith M.
*Bures, Joseph C.
*Burke, Eugene F.
*Burke, John P.
Burnett, James R.
Burns, Robert E.
*Burt, David L.
Burton, Charles D.
Bussard, Vernon R., Jr.
*Butcher, Bradley A.
- *Butterworth, Frank W., III
*Buxton, Donald G.
*Cagle, George F.
*Cahill, Edward H.
Caldwell, James F.
Caldwell, Robert K.
*Calhoun, John F.
*Calkins, Delos S., Jr.
*Callahan, Robert W.
*Calvert, John F.
*Calvin, Donald U.
*Cameron, Edward J.
*Camp, Lloyd B.
*Campbell, Craig S.
*Campbell, Robyn M., Jr.
*Campbell, William, Jr.
*Camper, James R.
*Cannon, Jesse D.
*Cannon, John W.
*Canter, Richard D.
*Cantrell, Walter H.
*Carleton, Jack E. L.
*Carleton, Reid P.
*Caron, Gerald C., Jr.
Carpenter, Lawrence J.
*Carr, Albert J., Jr.
*Carr, Samuel F.
*Carretta, Albert A., Jr.
*Carroll, Thomas D.
Carson, Aubrey W.
*Cartwright, Jackson E.
*Carver, Gerald J.
*Casagrande, Raymond J.
Casebeer, Macey M.
Cash, Bevedard L.
*Casselberry, Frederick J.
*Cater, Michael C.
*Caundry, Arthur R.
Cavin, Ralph W.
*Chadick, Wayne L.
Chafee, George B., Jr.
*Chaires, Charles A.
*Chamberlain, John D.
*Chambers, Perry R.
Chapman, Frederick W.
Chapman, William F.
Chapple, Michael W.
Chase, Bertram P.
Chase, Jack W.
*Chilcoat, John D.
*Childs, Johnny H.
*Chiocchio, Oddino S., Jr.
Christman, John A.
Christensen, Robert
*Christensen, Jerome W.
Clardy, Herman S., Jr.
*Clark, Bruce A.
*Clark, Charles F.
Clark, Charles W., Jr.
*Clark, Frederic M.
*Clark, Marvin I.
*Clark, Warren C., Jr.
*Clary, Robert A.
*Clay, Harry B., Jr.
Clement, Frank J.
*Cleveland, Robert M.
*Click, Howard H.
Clinton, John C.
*Clune, Edward M.
*Coats, Barry W.
*Cockrell, Charles W.
*Cockrell, Wilbur W.
*Collins, Richard F.
*Collins, William J.
*Comer, Robert F.
Comly, Samuel P., III
*Companion, Robert B.
*Compton, William H.
*Condon, Robert E.
*Cone, Joseph S.
- Conery, Francis A., III
*Conklin, Frank M., Jr.
*Cook, Gary D.
*Cook, Paul T.
*Cooke, Richard H.
Cooper, Grant A.
*Cooper, James V., Jr.
*Cooper, Paul W.
*Corbett, Robert L.
*Cordova, Richard N.
*Corliss, Walter F.
Cornelius, Harold W.
Correll, Ward W.
*Cosby, Millard A.
Cossairt, Larry A.
*Cotham, "L" "C" Jr.
*Coughlin, Leo J., Jr.
Cowdrill, David T.
*Cox, David R.
Cox, David B.
*Cox, Duane A.
*Cox, Jerry G.
*Cox, Kenneth E.
Coyle, Francis X.
Coyne, George K., Jr.
*Crahan, Patrick J.
Crane, Hugh R.
Crawford, Lawrence R.
*Credille, William C.
Creighton, George C., III
*Crews, Nelson R.
*Crithfield, Raymond L.
*Crombie, Todd A.
*Cross, Raymond
*Crumm, Richard D.
*Culhane, William P.
*Cullen, Charles W.
*Culp, Chester C., Jr.
*Cummings, Michael A.
Cummings, Paul Z., II
Curry, James D.
Curtis, Wayne
*Cuseo, Michael A., Jr.
*Custer, Edward S.
*Cutrell, Leonard E., Jr.
Cyr, Joseph H., Jr.
Dalebout, Ronald A.
*Dalton, Robert L.
Daniels, Shane P.
Darby, Jack N.
Darling, Donald L.
Darmand, Monte
*Darnauer, David E.
Dauber, Joseph G.
*Davies, Richard E.
*Davies, William
Davis, Billy E.
Davis, Chester C.
Davis, Dan A.
Davis, James V.
*Davis, John D.
*Davis, John R.
*Dawson, Phillip E., Jr.
*Dawson, William H.
Daybert, William K.
Dean, William J.
*Deboer, Johan W.
*Decarlo, John A.
Dee, James D., Jr.
Delaney, James L.
*Dellwo, Richard E.
Delong, Edgar E.
*Demand, Daniel H.
*Dennison, Terry A.
Depeyster, Robert B.
*Derieg, Daniel E.
Derr, Allen J.
*Desko, Daniel A.
*Desposito, John P.
*Dewalt, Gary L.
*Dewey, Robert T.
Dickmann, David B.
*Dietrich, William H.
Dillard, Theodis
*Dipalma, Robert F.
*Dishon, William E.
- Dittrick, John J., Jr.
Dodson, Paul E., Jr.
*Doe, Burdell F.
*Doe, Ralph F.
*Doeschot, Kenneth G.
*Doherty, Edward F.
*Doherty, Joseph F.
*Dombrowski, Henry R.
*Donnelly, John J.
Donovan, Francis R.
*Donovan, Neil
*Dooley, Thomas L., Jr.
Doss, Dale W.
*Doss, Marion T., Jr.
*Dothard, John J.
*Dougherty, William A., Jr.
Doyle, Thomas J.
*Drees, Marvin J.
*Dreessen, Francis M.
*Dubu, Francis T.
*Duff, Karl M.
*Duffey, Russell G.
*Dugan, William G.
Dunbar, Douglas P., Jr.
*Dunbar, Richard P.
Duncan, Donald G.
*Duncan, Garnett D.
Duncan, Pat
*Duncan, William E.
*Dundon, Alan M.
Dundore, Harold W.
*Durbine, James D.
*Duvall, Robert A.
Duvall, Thomas R.
Duxbury, Richard B.
*Dyer, Joe L., Jr.
*Dygart, Robert L.
Earley, William L.
*Eastman, Leonard C.
Eaton, David G.
*Eaton, James W., Jr.
*Eaton, Joe W.
*Eddleman, Harold E.
Eddy, Roger A.
*Edgemond, John W., III
Edmunds, Frank L., Jr.
*Edson, Philip N.
*Edwards, Donald L.
*Edwards, Marlon R.
*Edwards, Peter
Edwards, Scott
*Edwards, Steven H.
*Eikel, Harvey A.
*Eldredge, Floyd W.
Eldredge, Howard S.
Eller, Alvin L.
Elliott, David J.
*Elliott, Norman S., Jr.
*Elliott, Robert J.
*Elliott, William B.
*Ellis, Herbert A., Jr.
Ellis, Howard B., III
Ellis, Howard E.
Endter, Elmer W., Jr.
*Engelken, Ralph L.
*Engle, Raymond E.
Ensley, Arthur F.
*Entwistle, Thomas W., Jr.
*Eppert, Robert T.
Eppling, David C.
Erbacher, Anthony E.
*Erhardt, Francis J., Jr.
*Erichsen, Broder M.
*Erner, Eugene J.
*Erven, James S.
Estep, Vonnice D.
Estes, Albert R., Jr.
Estock, George Jr.
*Ettel, Michael J.
*Evanoff, John D.
*Evans, Gordon E.
Evans, Larry D.
- *Evans, Rowland G.
*Everstine, Charles W.
*Eytchison, Ronald M.
*Fannon, James E., Jr.
Farnham, David W.
*Farnsworth, Frederick F.
*Farrar, Bobby C.
*Farrell, Edmund F.
*Feeney, Edward J.
*Feeney, John S., Jr.
*Felderman, John L.
*Fenick, Joseph D., Jr.
*Feran, Paul M.
*Ferguson, Franklin E.
*Ferguson, John K.
*Ferguson, Roger L.
*Ferro, James L.
*Fesler, Robert J.
*Field, Blake E.
*Figura, Robert R.
Finch, Charles C.
*Findley, Anderson H., Jr.
*Findley, Thomas C.
*Fine, Morton B.
*Finnerty, Arthur J., Jr.
Finsterwald, Harold E.
*Fisher, James R.
Fiske, Charles M.
*Fisler, Louis H.
*Fitzgerald, Bernard M.
Fitzgerald, James L., Jr.
*Fitzpatrick, Chester L.
*Fitzpatrick, Thomas J.
*Fleishman, Anthony T.
*Fleming, Richard C., Jr.
Fleming, Thomas E.
*Flickinger, Dean F.
Flow, James W.
*Flowers, Thomas C., Jr.
Floyd, Francis M.
Fogarty, William M.
*Foltz, Richard W.
*Fondren, George
*Ford, Frank R., Jr.
*Ford, Raleigh R.
*Forhan, William P.
*Forsgren, Dean H.
Forsman, Charles J.
Forst, Frederick
*Foulk, William H.
*Fowlkes, John H.
*Fraas, Frederick V.
*Frank, Carl J.
Frank, Nickolas J., III
*Franklin, John S.
*Freakes, William
*Frear, Donald L.
*Frederick, Keith J.
*Fredericks, Harold A.
*Fuller, Charles A.
Fuller, Gran F.
*Fuller, Harry R., Jr.
*Fuller, Robert H.
Gadbaw, Coleman J., Jr.
*Gainer, Kenneth E.
*Gales, George M.
*Galstan, Gerald N.
Gamboa, John F.
*Ganister, Frank J.
Gann, Dewey L.
Gard, Perry W., III
*Gardner, John T., Jr.
*Garland, Keith P.
*Garrett, David W.
*Garvey, William A.
*Gass, James D.
Gatje, Peter H.
Gattis, Harold V.
*Gaudry, Byron A.

- *Gay, Warren L.
 *Geil, William
 *Gentry, Kerry F.
 *George, Hugo C.
 *Geraldson, Elmer L.
 Gerould, Donald E.
 Gessner, Bernard F., Jr.
 *Gibbons, Thomas
 Gibson, David B.
 *Gibson, Donald C.
 Gibson, Richard C., Jr.
 *Gibson, Ronald C.
 *Gies, Leo C.
 Giese, Carl E., Jr.
 Giesea, James R.
 *Gifford, Laurence S.
 *Giganti, George M.
 *Gilbert, William G.
 *Gillen, James F.
 Gilles, John M.
 *Gilligan, John K.
 *Glovanetti, Robert A.
 Given, Philip R.
 Gladin, Jack R.
 Glenn, Walter H.
 Gloeckner, Frank J., III
 *Glossner, Locke H.
 *Godfrey, Jack L.
 *Gofus, Joseph G., Jr.
 *Gogglin, James R.
 *Gold, Edward F.
 Goldstein, Gordon R.
 Goldsberry, Harold A.
 Goldy, Mark A.
 *Goodwin, James J.
 Goodwin, James C., Jr.
 Gordon, Bruce P.
 Gorham, David S.
 *Gosebrink, Fred J.
 *Goslin, Ralph A.
 *Goss, James E.
 Gottsche, Albert L., Jr.
 *Gough, Melvin N., Jr.
 Gould, Paul E.
 *Graff, Paul E.
 *Gram, Emil G.
 *Graves, Ernest O., Jr.
 *Gray, James D.
 Green, Frank C., Jr.
 Greer, George B., Jr.
 *Gregory, Robert H.
 *Griffin, Gerald B.
 Griffin, Hoke D.
 *Griffin, William H.
 Grimm, Thomas D.
 *Grocki, Chester J.
 Groder, Richard A.
 Gross, Alvin C., Jr.
 *Grosscup, Stephen J., Jr.
 *Gudmundson, Marvin L.
 Gunnels, Willis A.
 *Gurke, Donald L.
 *Gustafson, Robert T.
 Gustafson, Earl F.
 Gustafson, Kenneth R.
 Gustafson, Robert E.
 *Guthrie, William C.
 *Gwin, John O.
 Haag, Ernest V.
 Hagedorn, Edwin C.
 *Hagen, Robert F.
 *Hagey, Leroy R., Jr.
 *Hahn, Dwight E.
 *Haines, Charles E.
 *Hall, John W.
 Hall, Michael R.
 Haller, Hubert M.
 Haller, Manuel A.
 *Halloran, William R., Jr.
 *Halm, Terrence W.
 Halverson, Ralph A.
 *Halve, Lawrence A.
 *Hamaker, Rex G.
 *Hamilton, Jackie D.
 Hamilton, Larry D.
 Hamrick, James M.
 Hancock, Richard J., Jr.
 *Hanna, Donald V.
 Hansen, Harry J., III
 *Hansen, Herbert W., Jr.
 *Haralson, James B.
 *Harbrecht, Raymond J.
 Hardy, Ray S., Jr.
 *Harley, John K.
 *Harmon, Jimmy J.
 *Harper, Frances M., Jr.
 *Harper, Thomas J.
 Harrell, Dowel W.
 *Harris, Clarence H.
 *Harris, James O.
 *Harris, Jess M., III
 *Harris, Richard A.
 Harrison, Charles E.
 *Harsberger, Robert L.
 *Hartman, Phillip G.
 Harvey, Wilford H. H.
 *Harwell, Layne H.
 *Hassel, Rolland R.
 *Hastings, Ralph L.
 *Hausmann, Zohn D.
 *Hawkins, Carl L.
 Hawkins, James R.
 Hawkins, Ray M.
 *Hawn, Jere R.
 *Hayes, Jack E.
 *Hayes, Wilbur
 Hayes, William V.
 Hayman, William P.
 *Haynes, Jerry R.
 *Hayter, Roscoe, Jr.
 Hebert, Larry
 *Heck, Alger R.
 *Heckathorn, Clair E.
 *Heimbuecher, Frederick J.
 *Heindl, Floyd H.
 *Hekman, Peter M., Jr.
 *Helveston, Eugene H.
 *Henderson, William L.
 *Henderson, Noel B.
 *Henderson, Arnold H.
 *Henderson, Joseph R., Jr.
 Hendrix, Marion F.
 *Hensley, Jack K.
 Hernandez, Jesse J.
 *Herold, Lance
 *Herpick, Charles A.
 Herrin, William F.
 Hess, Ronald A.
 Hewett, Marie D.
 *Heydenberk, Delbert F.
 *Heyduck, William R.
 *Higgins, Harley J.
 Higgins, James D., Jr.
 *Hill, Eugene L.
 *Hill, John F.
 *Hill, Martin G.
 *Hilligan, Thomas J.
 *Hillman, Bernard M.
 *Hills, Robert E.
 Himmerich, Allison F.
 Hines, Rubert, Jr.
 Hinson, Elbert F.
 *Hinz, Orville C.
 Hobbs, Watson L.
 Hodgins, Jack A.
 *Hodges, Virgil C.
 Hodgkins, William S.
 Hodkins, William F.
 *Hoel, Jack I.
 *Hoff, Michael G.
 *Hoffman, George A.
 *Hoffman, William C.
 *Hoffmann, John M.
 Hogendobler, Clyde K.
 Hohmann, William D.
 *Hokeness, Sylvan P.
 Holcomb, Don
 Holland, John D., Jr.
 *Hollister, Floyd H.
 Holloman, Floyd W.
 *Holman, Henry F.
 *Holmberg, Bruce A.
 *Holmes, Dan N.
 *Holmes, Edward C.
 *Holsten, Donald W.
 *Holt, Arvil A.
 *Holt, Fred C.
 Holt, Jerry L.
 *Holt, William C.
 Holthaus, Hollis L.
 Holzhauser, Arthur E.
 Homuth, Richard W.
 *Hooks, Edward F.
 Hopkins, Jae E.
 *Hopkinson, Francis G.
 Horn, Leslie J.
 *Horne, William F.
 Hospes, Alan E.
 *Hostetler, Glen W.
 Hotard, William C.
 *Houston, Guy M., Jr.
 *Howard, Ronald C.
 Howard, William S., III
 *Hubitsky, John E.
 *Huckabay, William O., Jr.
 *Huddleston, Charles R., Jr.
 *Hudnall, Robert M.
 *Hughes, Robert L.
 Hughes, Robert C.
 Hulderman, George H.
 Hulme, John B.
 *Hummer, John J.
 *Hunt, Alan G.
 Hunter, Harold C.
 *Huntington, Stuart L.
 *Hurwitz, Paul M.
 *Hutchinson, Joseph D.
 *Hutchinson, Peter A.
 Ianson, Lawrence W., Jr.
 *Immerman, Arthur L.
 Ingle, Carl E.
 Ingram, Forney H., Jr.
 Ingram, Ronald F.
 *Inman, Raymond E.
 Irvin, Robert M.
 *Isaacson, Alan T.
 *Isherwood, Raymond T.
 *Ivey, Clarence G., Jr.
 Izard, James
 Jackson, Kermit J.
 Jackson, Milton, Jr.
 *Jackson, Morse R.
 Jackson, Paul F.
 Jackson, Perry Y., Jr.
 Jacobs, Paul H.
 *Jacobs, Thomas L.
 *Jacobsen, Philip H.
 *Jacobson, Mark A.
 Jaeger, James W.
 *Jakubczak, Jerome F.
 Jamroga, John J.
 Janes, Gregory H.
 *Jarrell, Jerry D.
 *Jasman, David A.
 *Jefferson, Donald G.
 *Jenkins, George J., Jr.
 *Jensen, Robert L.
 *Jewell, Arthur L.
 *Jewell, Harvey E.
 John, Arthur D.
 *Johnson, Curtis W.
 *Johnson, David H.
 *Johnson, Edward H.
 *Johnson, Lester O., Jr.
 *Johnson, Ronald L.
 *Johnson, Robert D.
 *Johnston, William A.
 *Jolliffe, Richard L.
 *Jones, Arden W. F., Jr.
 *Jones, Augustus B., III
 *Jones, Benjamin W.
 *Jones, Daniel P., Jr.
 Jones, Eugene P.
 *Jones, Francis P.
 *Jones, Harold L.
 *Jones, John S.
 Jones, Meredith R.
 *Jones, Roy L.
 *Jones, William D.
 Joslin, Ivan L.
 Judis, Billy F.
 *Jullano, Julius R.
 Kallal, James J.
 Kane, Frederic C., Jr.
 *Karmenzind, William P.
 *Karr, Richard P.
 Kauber, Rodney K.
 *Kauffman, William C.
 *Kaufman, Jerald D.
 Kaufman, Larry E.
 Keasler, Walter H.
 Keating, Robert C.
 *Keen, Arthur E.
 *Keenan, John D.
 *Keesler, Byron H.
 *Keiler, Joseph A.
 *Keim, Clarence H.
 *Keir, Stephen D.
 *Keith, Frederick W., Jr.
 *Keith, Robert T. S., Jr.
 *Keller, Lewis D.
 *Kelly, Harold W.
 Kelly, Robert J.
 *Kelly, William S.
 *Kelso, Howard
 Kendall, Robert P.
 *Kennedy, Dennis E.
 *Kennedy, Peter P.
 Kenney, James A.
 *Kensinger, Roy A.
 *Kernan, William O., Jr.
 *Kersh, John M.
 *Keske, Carl D.
 Kessler, Edward L., Jr.
 *Kessler, John C.
 *Kesterson, Aubrey V.
 Kesterson, Windolan W.
 *Kincade, Paul B.
 Kineke, John I.
 *King, Edwin S.
 *King, Larry N.
 Kingston, Kenneth H.
 Kinnier, John W.
 Kirby, Raymond E.
 *Kirk, Edward R.
 *Kirkconnell, William B.
 *Kirkman, Clyde T.
 *Kirkman, Roger J.
 *Kistler, George K.
 *Kitchens, Charles R.
 *Kivelle, William A.
 *Klinedinst, Paul R., Jr.
 *Klinger, Gerald F.
 *Knapp, Norman E., Jr.
 *Kober, Harry P., Jr.
 *Koch, William A.
 *Kockak, Edward J., Jr.
 Koenig, John W.
 *Kofnovec, Robert G.
 Kofeod, Robert M.
 *Kolb, John R.
 *Konkel, Harry W.
 *Kornegay, Robert R.
 Korslund, Robert G.
 *Kosoff, Tracy M.
 Kraft, Jacob C.
 *Krafer, William H.
 *Krehmeyer, James A.
 *Kreitner, Clinton W.
 *Krichman, Harold S.
 Krueger, Orton G.
 *Kruse, Henry J.
 *Kryway, John T.
 Kuechmann, Jerome A.
 *Kuehn, Gordon N.
 Kuhlke, Robert E.
 *Kuhn, James P.
 *Kuhn, Joseph L.
 Kuhneman, Martin F.
 Kunz, Chester A., Jr.
 *Kunz, Herman S.
 *Lachance, George M., Jr.
 *Lamaur, Virgil J.
 *Lamb, Ellis R., Jr.
 *Lambden, Jerry D.
 Lamoureux, Robert J.
 *Landaker, John A., Jr.
 *Landers, John D.
 *Landrum, Raymond G.
 *Lane, John W., Jr.
 Lanham, Mack S.
 Larkin, Russell J.
 Larson, Jerold J.
 Larson, Lawrence P.
 Larzelere, Charles W., III
 *Laskaris, Gus C. A.
 Lassiter, Eugene L.
 *Lauf, Joseph W.
 *Lavinder, Carlton L., Jr.
 Lawrence, Kent B.
 Laws, Charles F.
 Lawson, John R.
 *Leake, Milton H.
 *Leap, David P.
 *Leary, John A., II
 *Lee, Bobby C.
 *Lee, Richard H.
 Leech, Joseph W.
 *Leisy, Ned B.
 *Lence, James O.
 *Leroy, Franklin T.
 Lesko, Edward E.
 Leslie, William H.
 Leszczynski, Vincent J.
 *Levin, Roger L.
 *Lewis, Edgar E.
 Lewis, Frederick E.
 *Lewis, William A.
 *Leygraaf, Gerard J.
 *Lightstone, John L.
 Lima, John A.
 Lindsey, Eugene E., Jr.
 *Lindstrom, Theodore F.
 *Lineback, Harry W.
 Lineberger, Preston H.
 *Link, Richard J.
 *Lipke, Allan E.
 *Lipske, Robert S.
 *Lisle, George F.
 *Litton, Robert C.
 *Livens, Charles H.
 Livzey, James G.
 *Lloyd, George M.
 Lobb, Clarence E.
 *Lockard, William H.
 London, "J" Phillip
 *Long, George T.
 *Loose, Rudyard K.
 Lorts, Bryan M., Jr.
 Lorusso, John M.
 *Louis, David R., Jr.
 *Lovejoy, Richard E.
 Lowe, Ira
 *Lowe, Larry T.
 *Lubbers, Gary W.
 *Lucas, Clyde H., Jr.
 Lucas, Robert P.
 *Lucchesi, James W.
 *Luders, Ernest C.
 *Ludwig, Ronald E.
 *Luhrs, Larry L.
 *Lukenas, Leo A.
 Lupfer, Alexander M., Jr.
 *Lusk, James R.
 *Lyon, Hylan B., Jr.
 Lysaght, Clyde O.
 Mabrey, Richard L.
 *Macauley, William F.
 *MacGregor, Robert M.
 Machowski, Walter
 MacKenzie, Franklin F.
 *MacKinnon, John H.
 MacLean, Rupert E., Jr.
 *MacLeod, Wallace F., Jr.
 *MacNeill, Donald W.
 *Maddox, Rex A.
 Madsen, Marvin D.
 *Magee, Francis H.
 *Magee, James A.
 Major, James A.
 *Malleck, Andrew T.
 *Malone, Michael E.
 *Malone, Robert S.
 *Maloney, Thomas C.
 *Maloy, Larry L.
 *Mamele, Clayton C.
 Manahan, Maurice H.
 *Manely, Carl L.
 *Mansfield, Joseph S., Jr.
 Maroldy, Thomas M.
 *Marr, Thomas F.
 *Marr, William T.
 Marsh, Arnold D.
 *Marshall, Harold C., Jr.
 *Marshall, Robert L.
 Martin, Carl M.
 *Martin, James J., Jr.
 Martin, Richard L.
 *Martin, William T.
 Massa, Lawrence L.
 Massey, Lance B.
 *Matarazza, Ralph A.
 *Mather, Larry L.
 Matheson, John W.
 *Mattingly, Thomas K., II
 Mauz, Henry H., Jr.
 *Maviglia, Frank A.
 *May, Wesley
 *Mayer, Robert
 Mayers, Daniel F.
 *Mays, Samuel E., Jr.
 *Mazelka, Robert G.
 *Mazzola, Vincent S.
 *Mcadams, Charles F.
 *McBride, Joseph W., Jr.
 *McBrien, Jack W.
 *McCabe, Herman W.
 McCain, John S., III
 *McCandless, Bruce, II
 McCann, John J.
 *McCarter, Jonathan C.
 *McCarty, Kenneth R.
 McCauley, Victor
 McConnell, Harry E.
 *McConville, Edwin B.
 McCorry, John H.
 *McCroskey, Bobby R.
 *McCullough, David U.
 *McCullough, Martin L.
 *McDaniel, Robert S.
 McDermott, James J.
 McDermott, Richard J.
 *McDonald, John W.
 McDonald, Michael H.
 *McDonough, Robert N.
 *McFadyen, John B.
 *McFarland, Thomas G., Jr.
 *McGayhey, Francis J.
 *McGhee, Kenneth B.
 *McGrath, James J.
 *McGraw, Lloyd H.
 *McGruther, Gordon T.

- *McGuirk, William E.
 *McInvalle, Joe B.
 *McKeithan, Alton L.
 McKenzie, Gene T.
 *McKenzie, Walter K.
 *McKneely, Jerry A.
 McLaine, Warren E., Jr.
 *McLane, Michael J.
 *McLaughlin, Bruce C.
 *McMackin, Lawrence J.
 *McMahon, Marvin R., Jr.
 *McMichael, John C., Jr.
 McMillan, John G.
 McNulla, James E., III
 *McQuay, Robert B.
 *McRight, Clarence, Jr.
 *McVadon, Eric A., Jr.
 McVicker, James L.
 *Medlin, William R.
 *Meenan, Robert L.
 *Meers, Alfred J.
 *Meese, Richard E.
 *Megonigle, Carl E.
 *Meinhold, Richard J.
 *Meinig, George R., Jr.
 *Meisner, George L.
 *Michael, Michael J., Jr.
 *Mergo, Nicholas J.
 Merriken, Stuart A.
 *Merrill, Harold H.
 Merritt, Ernest A.
 *Merry, John F.
 Merry, Theodore R.
 Metzger, Delbert S.
 *Meyer, Dale A.
 *Meyer, Donald C.
 *Midgarden, Peter N.
 Midtvedt, Harold L.
 *Miklas, Ramutis K.
 Miller, Aloysius R.
 Miller, Billy G.
 Miller, Charles L.
 *Miller, Douglas A.
 *Miller, George W., Jr.
 *Miller, Henry W., Jr.
 *Miller, Larry S.
 *Miller, Robert D.
 Miller, Robert L.
 Mills, Christopher M.
 *Miltnerberger, James R.
 *Minnock, Francis J.
 *Mitchell, Anthony A.
 Mitchell, Kenneth F.
 Mitchell, Walter F.
 Mixson, Riley D.
 *Monroe, Philip A.
 *Montag, Charles F.
 *Montalbano, Gary E.
 Monteath, Gordon M., Jr.
 *Moore, Henry L.
 Moore, Jack E.
 *Moore, Rufus B.
 *Moore, William N.
 Moran, Francis J., Jr.
 Moreland, Floyd E.
 Morgan, David E.
 *Morgan, Robert W.
 *Morris, Clyde C.
 *Morrison, Frederick S.
 Morrison, Jerry E.
 *Morrow, Billy R.
 *Morrow, Roy C.
 *Mortenson, William P.
 Moser, Robert L.
 Mosman, Donald E.
 *Moss, Robert L.
 Mott, George E., III
 Mowery, Russell V.
 *Moynihan, John J.
 Mueller, Lincoln H.
- *Mueller, William A.
 *Mullaly, Raymond K.
 Mullaly, William J.
 *Mullins, Kenneth P.
 *Munch, Charles H.
 *Munson, John H.
 *Murphy, Chester A.
 *Murphy, Norbert P.
 *Murray, Gordon L., Jr.
 *Murray, Joseph W.
 Musgrove, Robert W.
 Myers, George D., II
 *Myers, Stephen G.
 *Nagle, Richard D., Jr.
 *Nahlovsky, Richard E.
 *Nakagawa, Gordon R.
 *Nall, Harold W.
 Nance, Ivan V. A., Jr.
 *Narro, Arthur T.
 *Nash, Norman B.
 *Nazak, Robert M.
 *Nedry, Robert D.
 *Nelson, Henry E.
 Nelson, Mark V. V.
 *Nelson, Richard M.
 *Nesbit, Arthur M.
 *Newcomb, David A.
 Newell, James F., Jr.
 *Newton, George B., Jr.
 *Nicholas, Jack R., Jr.
 *Nichols, John B., III
 Nicholson, Walker D.
 *Nickerson, Walt S., Jr.
 Nicolls, Robert P.
 *Niedbala, Joseph T., Jr.
 Nolan, Bob J.
 Nolan, Bruce F.
 *Nordell, Dean E.
 *Norfleet, Eric H.
 Norton, Lee E., Jr.
 *Nott, William J.
 *Nottoli, George F.
 *Nunnery, Alex M., Jr.
 *Nutting, Roger M.
 Nystrom, Peter C.
 *Obeirne, Frank, Jr.
 *O'Brien, John
 *O'Brien, Walter H.
 *O'Connell, Charles F., Jr.
 *Ogren, John P.
 *O'Leary, John P., Jr.
 *Oleson, Charles A.
 *Oliver, Earl L.
 *Oliver, William H.
 *Olmstead, Clifford D.
 *Olson, Kenneth A.
 *Olson, Roy A.
 Olsonoski, Richard L.
 Onberg, William F.
 Oncea, George
 O'Neal, Edward A.
 *O'Neill, William A.
 *O'Neill, Cornelius T.
 Orme, Douglas L.
 *Osberg, John W., III
 Osborne, James T.
 *Osborne, Robert B.
 *Ostrander, William E.
 *Otto, Carl H.
 Overbeck, Bryon K., Jr.
 *Overholser, Merlin K.
 Overton, Dudley R.
 *Owen, Robert S.
 *Owens, Ramon R.
 Pabst, Howard L.
 *Pace, Harvey L., Jr.
 *Page, Richard L.
 *Paine, Paul W.
 *Painter, Orville E.
 *Palmer, James A., Jr.
 *Pape, Jerry L.
 *Papi, Lawrence A.
- *Pappas, Albert J.
 *Park, Newell D., Jr.
 *Parker, Donald F.
 *Parker, Richard S.
 Parks, Terrence J.
 *Parks, William H.
 Parrish, David F.
 *Pascucci, Frederick T.
 *Pate, Zachariah T., Jr.
 Patella, Lawrence M.
 *Patrick, Meredith W.
 *Patrick, William M.
 Patrick, William D.
 *Peace, Oscar
 *Pearce, Michael A.
 *Pederson, Noel N.
 *Peechatka, Larry O.
 *Peirson, Robert A.
 Pellerin, Alfred E., III
 *Pender, Thomas
 *Pendergrass, Curtis S.
 Pendleton, David L.
 *Pendley, William T.
 Penny, Lawrence A.
 *Peoples, Leroy
 Peri, Victor P.
 *Perkins, Robert S., Jr.
 *Perusse, Robert E.
 *Peters, John D.
 Peters, Milton G.
 Peterson, Carl J.
 Peterson, Charles B.
 *Peterson, Robert A.
 Pettitt, John T., Jr.
 Pfister, Donald L.
 *Phelps, George T.
 *Phillips, Clifford R.
 Phillips, John C.
 *Phillips, Ronald J.
 *Phillips, Robert E.
 *Phillips, Samuel B.
 *Pickering, Gary W.
 *Pidgeon, Robert H.
 *Pierce, George E.
 *Pierson, Irwin B.
 *Pigg, Bobby J.
 *Pilcher, Eugene T.
 *Pingel, Leon J.
 *Pinson, Peter C.
 Pinto, John M., Jr.
 *Ploske, William C.
 Piskorski, Stanley
 *Pitman, John R.
 Pittenger, Richard F.
 Pivarnik, William D.
 *Pizinger, Donald D.
 *Poarch, Charles E.
 Poarch, William H.
 *Poland, Clarence, Jr.
 Pollock, Grant H.
 *Polski, Paul A.
 *Poore, James S.
 Poremba, Stanley, Jr.
 *Port, Joseph C.
 *Porter, Gene H.
 *Porter, Oliver H.
 Potter, John L.
 *Potter, Robert A.
 *Pouliot, Donald J.
 *Powell, Frederick C.
 Powell, Ralph E.
 Powers, Richard M.
 *Prather, Robert J., Jr.
 *Pratt, John L.
 *Prenzlau, Roger E.
 *Pressly, James M.
 *Preston, Craig A.
 *Prevo, Kyle T., Jr.
 Price, Billie L.
 Pritchard, William J.
 Proctor, Robert R.
 *Pruitt, Arnold W.
 *Przekurat, Eugene E.
 Pugh, Jimmy B.
 Pulling, Wayne E.
 *Purnell, Clement I.
 *Putman, James L.
 Putnam, Wayne A.
- *Pyatt, Arnold F.
 *Pye, Reginald C., Jr.
 *Pyle, Ronald W.
 *Quay, Thomas W.
 Quick, James W.
 Quinn, Eugene F.
 Quinn, Richard H.
 *Ragen, Jerome C.
 *Ramsden, Gerald L.
 *Randle, Benjamin W.
 *Randolph, Billy R.
 Ranes, George J.
 *Rasmussen, John D.
 Rasmussen, Keith L.
 *Ratto, Lawrence J.
 Rau, Walter A.
 Rauch, Leo A.
 Raudio, Victor J.
 Read, Dennis S.
 *Reader, James M.
 *Redwine, Lonnie R., Jr.
 *Reed, John C.
 *Reed, Ned W.
 *Reed, Robert A., II
 *Reed, William T.
 Reeger, Harold L.
 Regan, James D.
 Rehder, William A.
 *Reich, William F.
 Reid, Lawrence R., Jr.
 *Reilly, Robert K.
 *Reister, Walter A.
 *Remoll, Charles M.
 *Rennie, Norman L.
 Repp, Robert W.
 *Retz, Michael J.
 Retzlaff, Robert R.
 Reynolds, Bernard J.
 Rice, Lloyd K.
 *Rice, Oscar G.
 *Rice, William L.
 *Rich, Roger L., Jr.
 *Richard, James E.
 *Richards, Richard V.
 *Richey, Raymond C.
 *Richter, Eugene, Jr.
 Rigdon, William H.
 *Riggs, Donald E.
 *Riley, William E.
 Ringler, Arnold H.
 *Riordan, William P.
 *Ripple, James E., Jr.
 *Ritmire, Kenneth D.
 Rivera, Daniel R.
 Roach, Alan G.
 Robbins, Berton A., III
 Robbins, John E.
 *Roberson, William P.
 *Roberts, Earl L.
 *Roberts, James H.
 *Roberts, Jack L.
 *Roberts, Tim H.
 *Roberts, William D.
 *Robertson, Robert D.
 *Robins, Harry B., Jr.
 Robinson, Kenneth G.
 Robison, Delma C.
 Rocray, Samuel E.
 Roder, Peter S.
 *Rogers, Donald K.
 *Rogers, Gerald W.
 *Rogers, Richard D.
 *Rohrbough, John D.
 *Rokowski, Ernest L.
 *Roll, Charles A.
 *Roper, Daniel P.
 *Roper, Samuel V.
 Rosen, Robert S.
 *Rothrauff, Thomas B.
 *Roubik, Arthur F.
 Rouse, Charles F., Jr.
 *Rouse, Walstein M.
 Rowden, Donald R.
 *Rowland, Richard P.
 Royle, Perry R., Jr.
 *Rubenacker, Robert G.
 Rueckert, Nils
 Rufe, Robert W.
 *Rumney, Robert E.
- *Runzo, Melvin A.
 *Ruona, Keith V.
 *Russell, Cleveland H.
 Russell, Harold B.
 *Russell, Leverett E.
 *Ruthford, Donald C.
 *Sachse, Clark D.
 *Sallee, Ralph W.
 *Salmon, Walter W., Jr.
 *Salyer, Ronald G.
 Sample, Bobbie L.
 *Sampson, James W.
 Sansom, Robert G., Jr.
 *Sapp, Edford W.
 Sauer, Robert C.
 *Scanlon, Edward P.
 *Scantlin, William S.
 Scarbrough, Vernon R.
 *Schaffer, Ruben W.
 *Scheidt, Peter J.
 Schlauder, Wallace J.
 *Schloemer, Robert D.
 *Schmidt, Oscar H.
 *Schoenfeld, Jay K.
 *Schooncraft, James L.
 *Schoonover, Richard T.
 Schramm, William G.
 *Schroeder, Stephen F.
 Schultz, Robert F.
 *Schulz, Russell K.
 *Schulz, William J.
 *Schwartz, Donald M.
 *Scott, Milton M.
 Scram, Andrew D.
 *Sealey, John W.
 Sears, David F.
 *Sears, Gilbert H., Jr.
 *Secor, Richard A.
 Seeberger, John J.
 Seger, Ralph L., Jr.
 *Seidel, Melvin L.
 *Sell, Kenneth A.
 *Sendek, Joseph M.
 *Seng, William R.
 *Shand, Richard M.
 Shaper, Allen L.
 *Sharp, Bill W.
 *Shattuck, George W.
 *Shawkey, Dallas W.
 Sheehan, James E.
 Shelton, James W.
 *Shepherd, Harold D.
 Sheppard, Donald D.
 Sherman, John E.
 *Sherrad, Douglas F.
 *Shiffett, Edward E.
 *Shope, Leonard S.
 Shope, Theodore L.
 *Showman, Loyd C., Jr.
 *Shriver Norman W.
 *Shriver, Robert A.
 Sickman, John F., Jr.
 *Siegwarth, Charles E., Jr.
 *Sillery, Charles D.
 *Sills, Alex M.
 *Simmons, James L.
 *Simonson, Gerald L.
 Sims, Robert B.
 *Skezas, George C.
 *Skinner, Albert G.
 *Skinner, George R.
 *Slater, Richard L.
 *Slaven, Robert K., Jr.
 *Slayman, Kelson E.
 Slye, Richard E.
 Smedberg, Edwin B.
 Sminkey, Robert L.
 *Smith Bennie J.
 *Smith, Charles J.
 *Smith, Clyde A.
 *Smith, David R.
 *Smith, Donald D.
 *Smith, Leonard T.
 *Smith, Nepler V.
 *Smith, Paul D.
 *Smith, Peter T.
 Smith, Samuel
 Smith, William B.
- Smith, William L.
 *Smolnik, Daniel
 *Snow, Barry I.
 *Snyder, Jerry E.
 *Sokolowski, Alfred
 Sommer, Henry J., Jr.
 *Sorenson, Richard S.
 *Sorna, Ronald E.
 *Soules, Charles W.
 *Southworth, Frank C., Jr.
 *Sowada, Claude A.
 Spadoni, Eugene A.
 *Spencer, Thomas J.
 *Spivey, Walter H.
 Spraker, Irvin L.
 Spydell, Robert E.
 *Stacy, Louis O., Jr.
 *Staff, Roger S.
 *Stanfield, Donald G.
 *Stark, William R.
 *Starrin, Roy E.
 Stavropoulos, Ernest G.
 *Stebbins, Donald J.
 *Steckler, Joseph L.
 Steed, Samuel
 Steele, Robert J.
 *Stein, Edwin F., Jr.
 *Steine, Zachary
 *Steiner, Frederick N.
 Stephens, William L.
 *Sterling, Robert F., Jr.
 Stevely, Robert V.
 *Stevenson, Frederick R.
 *Stewart, Earl W.
 *Stewart, George W., Jr.
 Stibler, Robert W.
 Stinson, William O.
 Stockton, Cecil G.
 *Stoker, Laron L.
 *Stokes, Carl J., Jr.
 Stone, Robert L.
 *Storey, Edward L.
 Story, Roy K.
 *Strain, Gary C.
 *Straney, Donal R.
 Streeter, Gregory F.
 Strickland, George W.
 *Strole, Dennis S.
 *Strouts, Robert A.
 *Stubbs, David W.
 *Stubbs, George R.
 Stumcke, Frederick B., Jr.
 *Sturdivant, George W.
 Sturgill, Jack D.
 Sturr, Henry D., Jr.
 *Sullivan, Donald R.
 *Sullivan, Gerald F.
 Summers, Carl E.
 *Surratt, Henry C., Jr.
 *Suttmann, Marvin H.
 Sutton, Charles R.
 Sutton, Jack D.
 *Swahn, Charles N.
 *Swain, Donald D.
 Swain, John R.
 *Swallow, James R.
 Swarthwood, Willis M.
 *Swendsen, Donald M.
 *Swisher, Dale W.
 *Switzer, James D., Jr.
 *Sword, Curtis S., Jr.
 *Szczecinski, Joseph L.
 *Taft, Denis J.
 *Tarkowski, Ronald C.
 *Tarquin, Donald C.
 Taylor, Brent W.
 Taylor, Donald A.
 Taylor, James T., Jr.
 Taylor, James R. C.
 *Taylor, Jimmie W.
 Taylor, Philip H.
 *Taylor, Thomas P.
 *Taylor, Vance A.
 Tedder, James E.

- Templeton, Felix E.
 *Tenebrancia, Ambrose J.
 *Terry, Bert D.
 *Terry, Morris K.
 *Terry, Ross R.
 *Therrien, Leo E., Jr.
 *Thiemann, Henry J. F., Jr.
 Thomas, Jack R.
 *Thomas, John D.
 *Thomas, Kinnison H.
 *Thomas, Richard K.
 Thomas, Richard S.
 Thomas, Robert H.
 *Thomasson, William O.
 Thompson, George L.
 *Thompson, Glynn M.
 Thompson, Harold L.
 *Thompson, John W.
 *Thompson, Marion R.
 *Thompson, Tyler H.
 *Thurston, John K.
 *Tibbatts, Thomas N.
 *Tilger, Billy R.
 *Toney, Robert L.
 *Topping, Robert L.
 Torsen, Richard M.
 Trayer, Edgar G.
 Tree, Merle E.
 *Triebe, Carl J., Jr.
 *Triemer, William L.
 *Trout, Michael D.
 *Troutman, Darrell C.
 *Truitt, Harry D.
 Truly, Richard H.
 Tuft, Markham D.
 *Turlay, William E.
 *Turner, Danny W.
 *Turner, Preston H.
 *Urry, Raymond L.
 *Usalis, Jerome T.
 *Valana, James G.
 Vannoppes, Russell G.
 *Vanoutrive, Harold J.
 Vargo, Henry G.
 Veasey, Guy D.
 *Veenstra, Robert M.
 *Venable, David B.
 *Venable, Robert L.
 Verner, Michael J.
 *Vervain, Charles H.
 *Viccillo, John S.
 *Vick, John C.
 *Victor, Alfred E.
 *Victor, James A.
 Vinson, John T.
 *Vold, Almer C.
 Wachter, Gary L.
 *Wagner, Harry E.
 *Wagner, William F.
 *Waldner, Clarence G.
 Walker, Dodson D., Jr.
 *Walker, Muthy D., Jr.
 *Walsh, David L.
 Walston, Kenneth R.
 Walters, Robert L.
 *Walton, Charles R.
 *Wandell, John J., Jr.
 *Wanglie, Eugene E.
 *Ward, James J.
 *Warner, James S.
 *Warner, Lloyd
 Warren, Robert L.
 *Wartenberg, Ernest H., Jr.
 *Wasloski, John E.
 *Waters, Ronald L.
 Watkins, Robert M.
 Watson, Ian M.
 *Watts, Donald T.
 Waymire, Donald M.
 Weir, Lawrence E., Jr.
 *Weaver, Alpine D.
 Weaver, Daniel C.
 Weaver, Robert E.
 *Webster, Audrey C.
 Webster, Stephen T.
 Weeks, Theodore G., Jr.
- Weibly, Robert L.
 *Weigand, James G.
 *Weiler, Antone M.
 Welser, Conrad W., Jr.
 Welles, Bradford W.
 *Wells, Aaron L.
 *Wells, Carl C., Jr.
 *West, Ralph W., Jr.
 *Westbrook, Dale A.
 Westerman, William R.
 Wettstead, Norman C.
 *Weyrich, Henry, Jr.
 Whaley, Orville R., Jr.
 Wheatley, Gary F.
 *Wheeler, George C.
 *White, Charles E.
 White, Clayton R.
 *White, Ervin E.
 *White, Fred D.
 White, Howard G.
 *White, Ray A.
 *White, Robert W.
 Whitehead, James L.
 *Whitmer, Benjamin F.
 Whitmire, Robert L.
 *Wickham, Albert G.
 *Wicklund, Richard J.
 Wiedemann, Franz R.
 *Wiedenbauer, Fred
 *Wiener, Thomas F.
 *Wilcox, Bruce A.
 Wilcox, John B.
 Wilderman, Alvin L.
 Wile, Robert C.
 Wilkerson, Charles A.
 *Wilkinson, Alan C.
 *Willett, John A., Jr.
 *Williams, Dale H.
 *Williams, Eldon G.
 *Williams, James D.
 Williams, James R.
 *Williams, Kenneth W.
 *Williams, Robert C.
 *Willis, John W.
 Wills, Everette D.
 *Willyard, Maurice D.
 *Wilmot, Jim W.
 Wilner, Arthur I.
 *Wilson, Claude D., Jr.
 *Wilson, Emory H.
 Wilson, James S., Jr.
 *Wilson, Richard J.
 *Withers, William Z.
 *Wolfe, Ronald L.
 Wood, Leland E., Jr.
 *Woodbury, Michael G.
 Woodley, Richard P.
 Woody, Melvin R.
 Worden, Everett F.
 *Wren, Gregory S.
 *Wright, David J.
 Wright, Frederick W., III
 Wright, James C.
 *Wright, Lee F.
 *Wright, Leo C.
 *Wright, Mack
 Wright, Paul M.
 *Wright, Robert H., III
 *Wright, Russell W.
 *Wuorenmaa, John P.
 *Wurth, John G.
 *Wyatt, Richard L.
 Wyman, Harry N., III
 Yoes, Ernest C.
 Yost, Albert N.
 *Young, Arthur E., Jr.
 Young, Howard L., Jr.
 *Young, Robert A.
 *Young, Sol
 *Young, Wayne G.
 Zanin, Norman R.
 Zanin, Wilbur F., Jr.
 Zon, Ernest
 *Zorbach, Anthony J.
 Zorn, Nicholas D.
 Zurfuh, Robert M.
 Zwart, Ronald P.
- Abrams, Robert L.
 Adams, Curtis D.
 Altaker, Lawrence L.
 Armimo, Anthony
 Ashworth, Halbert E.
 Asiaf, Joseph R.
 Baker, Fred L.
 Baksic, Russell W.
 Basiliere, James L.
 Batcheller, John W.
 *Beidler, Jon G.
 Bendixen, Romaine L.
 Bendorf, Ronald L.
 Billharz, David W.
 Billings, William E., Jr.
 *Bishop, Hal D.
 Blackburn, Frank C.
 Blanchard, Peter B.
 Blanton, Terrell D.
 Boensch, Frank N., Jr.
 Bohan, Lawrence D.
 Bohan, Michael
 *Bowman, Robert L.
 *Bradley, Charles K.
 Bradley, Mark
 Braun, William E.
 Brien, Robert L.
 Broussard, Nicholas D.
 Buchanan, Robert D.
 Buell, Howard A.
 Bunnell, Henry K.
 Burmeister, Ronald E.
 *Burrow, Woody G.
 Candela, Harry J.
 Carmick, Edward S., Jr.
 Carr, Raymond E.
 Cassidy, Calvin R.
 Cattano, Andrew N.
 Closson, Jon B.
 Collins, Terence R.
 Combs, James A.
 Condrin, William R.
 *Conrad, Frederick E.
 Cook, James H., Jr.
 Cook, John P.
 Cook, Joseph V., Jr.
 *Corcoran, Francis H.
 Cottingham, James W.
 Crawford, William R.
 *Crittenden, Frank M., Jr.
 Crosson, Robert C.
 *Crum, Paul M.
 Davis, Donald F.
 Davis, Henry F.
 Davis, James E.
 Day, Daniel H.
 Deane, Frederick R. M.
 Dennison, William L., Jr.
 Dooley, John R.
 Downing, John E.
 Doxey, Clem M., Jr.
 Driscoll, John M., Jr.
 Earls, Jim H.
 Espenchade, Park W., Jr.
 Evans, Donald T.
 Eyre, Warren G.
 Eytel, Charles S.
 Farmer, Raymond M.
 Farrell, Robert E.
 *Field, Marshall P.
 Flagler, Nicholas R.
 Fong, Don L.
 Gable, Thomas W.
 Gail, Thomas A.
 Gaskins, Ronald D.
 *Gaudry, Charles L., Jr.
 Gibbons, James A.
 Gibbs, Robert L.
 Godbey, Asa L., Jr.
 Goscinski, Philip J.
 *Graham, Curtis G.
 Greene, James N.
 Griffin, George E., III
 *Griffin, William M.
- *Grumblin, Hudson V., Jr.
 Gwinn, Byron C., II
 *Hailey, Stanley W., Jr.
 Hall, James N.
 *Hammer, David J.
 Hand, John J.
 Hayden, Donald J.
 Hayworth, Ray M.
 Heath, Victor C.
 *Heinz, Wilbur A., Jr.
 Hemmings, Ira L., Jr.
 Henrie, Edwin J.
 Hensley, Ronald V.
 Holmstrom, Robert D.
 Honigman, Joseph
 Hood, Richard N.
 Howell, James W.
 Huff, Arden L.
 Huurman, Walter W., Jr.
 *Jackson, Neil D.
 *Johnson, William C., Jr.
 *Johnston, Charles E.
 Jones, Lawrence A.
 *Joynor, Raymond K.
 Jung, Robert M.
 Karney, Walter W.
 Kenny, Geves S.
 *Killingler, Robert P.
 *Kloek, Jan G.
 *Kravetz, Neil D.
 Lewis, David H.
 Lignelli, Gregory J.
 Llewellyn, Henry J., II
 Lloyd, Morgan P.
 Lowry, Louis D.
 Lucas, John T.
 *Maralst, Donald J.
 Marlor, Russell L.
 Marriott, John D.
 Martin, Miles H., Jr.
 Martin, Russell D.
 *Masar, Maurice F. P.
 Matan, Joseph A.
 *Mathews, Carter W.
 Mattern, Allan L.
 *Maxwell, George D.
 McCreedy, James E.
 McDonough, Edward R.
 McLean, William E.
 Meier, Gerald F.
 *Meighan, Jacob W.
 Millikan, Larry E.
 Mills, Robert D.
 Mixon, William A.
 *Mollerus, Robert J.
 Mollycheck, Ralph
 *Morales, Raul A.
 *Moynan, Roland W.
 Mueller, Maurice J., Jr.
 Mullen, James E.
 *Murray, James A.
 *Musser, John R., Jr.
 Neel, Rufus G.
 Nelms, Robert J., Jr.
 Newman, Paul K.
 Niebaum, Lowell T.
 Nugent, Clifton C.
 Nuss, Robert C.
 Oxley, Dwight K., III
 Parsons, David E.
 Pepino, Alfred T.
 Perkins, Richard E.
 Peters, Norman E.
 Pierce, William B.
 Plautz, Joseph W.
 *Putnam, Theodore I.
 Redfield, William J.
 Robbins, Thomas O.
 Roberts, James G.
 Robinson, Jerry M.
 Rubottom, Richard L.
 Ruggiero, Joseph A.
 Sandri, Sandro R.
- Schaffer, Berton T.
 Schalker, David E.
 *Schmid, William H.
 Schmidt, Harold W., II
 Schmidt, Rainer S.
 Schroeder, Charles F.
 Sharp, Robert C.
 Sheskey, Michael C.
 Slate, Robert W.
 Smith, David A.
 Smith, Lee E.
 Sokolowski, Joseph W., Jr.
 Sothoron, Warren H., Jr.
 Stager, James F.
 Stone, George M., II
 Stone, Robert S.
 Stone, William A.
 Stoughton, Richard R.
 Talcott, Donald A.
 Texter, John H., Jr.
 Thomas, Jerry L.
- Thurmon, Theodore F., III
 Turalds, Talvaris
 *Vacanti, Charles J., Jr.
 Vanderhooft, Gerard F.
 Vangenderen, Larry
 VanPelt, Philip R.
 Vidacovich, Richard P.
 Wallin, John D.
 Wadalowski, Roman T.
 Warner, John F.
 Wasson, Robert D.
 *Weinstein, Sheridan L.
 Woods, Thomas A.
 *Worsham, Jerry C.
 Wright, James W.
 *Yohn, Kenneth C.
 Young, William D.
- SUPPLY CORPS
 *Allen, Robert A., Jr.
 Austin, Walter I.
 Baker, James H.
 *Barbary, Howard J.
 *Basley, Raymond C.
 *Basse, Warner P.
 *Beaman, Thomas S.
 *Beyer, Robert K.
 *Blackburn, Richard C., Jr.
 *Blazina, Joseph B.
 *Bonbright, John M., Jr.
 *Boorman, William R.
 *Bowne, Charles J., Jr.
 Boylan, Charles T.
 *Brown, George C.
 *Brown, James W.
 *Buell, Robert M.
 Caro, James M.
 *Carver, Roy E.
 *Cejka, Joseph L.
 *Charette, Paul E.
 Clarkson, James S.
 *Cobb, James L.
 *Cole, Brady M.
 *Collins, Charles J.
 *Cone, Paul J.
 *Connolly, Robert I.
 *Conquest, Donald D.
 *Coon, Paul D.
 *Cooper, Jackie R.
 *Corrigan, John J., Jr.
 *Costa, Richard D.
 *Couch, Jefferson B.
 *Culpepper, Glenn C.
 *Davis, Arthur R.
 *Davis, John R.
 *Dellis, Donald O.
 Denny, James L.
 Deruggiero, Saverio A.
 *Doddridge, Benjamin F.
 Dodson, Dale E.
 *Dolan, Henry J.
 Drake, Claude H.
 Drury, William R.
 *Eilberg, James S.
 Ekholm, Harry H., Jr.
 *Erickson, James L.
 Eye, Charles C.
 *Fischer, Gregory F.
 Fish, Dennis J.
 *Flanagan, Patrick F.
 Fraher, Jeremiah
 French, Robert L.
 *Gage, Robert B.
 Garner, Fred S.
 *Gavin, Victor M.
 *Getrige, John J.
 *Giles, Robert B.
 Gillingham, Roger D.
 *Gleason, Bernard L.
 *Gordon, David G.
 Goss, Roland A.
 Graves, Earl W.
 *Gray, Lloyd C.
 *Greenway, Milford K.
- *Gregory, Kenneth R.
 *Grogan, Arthur R.
 *Haj, Richard
 Hanna, Robert M.
 Hanson, Allan H.
 *Hardy, Allen
 *Harnad, Paul K.
 *Hartlieb, Daniel G.
 *Hawkins, Floyd A.
 Hazlett, Harry L.
 *Herbst, Isadore A.
 Hicks, Chesley M., Jr.
 *Hinds, Douglas J.
 *Hinz, Dan H.
 Hogan, Richard C.
 *Hoopes, Ronald G.
 *Horner, Norman K.
 *Hunt, Rutherford E.
 Huth, Carl F., Jr.
 *Itzkowitz, Harold B.
 Jaecques, Raymond C.
 *Jensen, Nels P.
 *Johnson, Donald J.
 Johnson, Omer L.
 *Jones, William G.
 *Kaplan, Sumner H.
 Keith, Bobby P.
 *Kelly, Harry T.
 *Klein, Carl C.
 Knight, James W., Jr.
 *Konopik, Joseph F., Jr.
 *Leeper, Dale E.
 *Lemmo, Joseph G.
 Lindberg, Arthur E.
 *Liter, Theodore G.
 Livingston, Kenneth E.
 Lombard, Graydon F.
 Lord, Charles W.
 Lucas, Duane B.
 *Lyman, Lawrence G.
 Marbain, Max D.
 *Marian, John B., II
 *Masters, Edward R.
 Maxwell, John R.
 *McCarthy, Donald L.
 *McCauley, Joseph M.
 McCloskey, Michael A.
 *McClure, Mason B.
 McGee, William A.
 *McHugh, John J.
 *McKelvey, Paul N.
 *McNary, William F.
 *Michura, John J.
 *Miller, Winston B.
 *Montgomery, Samuel S.
 *Moon, Carl R.
 *Murphy, Allen R.
 *Nace, Wilbert J.
 Nix, Harvey W., Jr.
 *Oberhofer, Andrew O., Jr.
 Olson, Engwall A., III
 *Ostergard, Donald L.

*Overfelt, Arthur E.
 *Owens, James C.
 *Pacofsky, Bartholomew
 *Pannek, Walter A.
 *Patterson, James F.
 *Pollard, James O.
 *Powell, Hal B.
 *Powers, Richard F.
 *Randall, Harold N., Jr.
 *Reeder, Vanlear, L.
 *Regan, Francis J.
 *Reynolds, Byron
 *Risinger, Robert E.
 *Rogers, William J., Jr.
 *Rosenblum, James E.
 *Schrank, Joseph P.
 *Sells, Alan D.
 *Sieviers, Louis A., Jr.
 *Simmons, Troy W.
 *Smith, Everett C.
 *Spence, George G., Jr.
 *Stammer, Edward S.
 *Street, Edward L.
 *Stutts, Jack H.
 *Sveen, Gerald E.
 *Swartz, Alex E.
 *Tadlock, Don L.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

*Ahern, Bernard J.
 *Beach, Stanley J.
 *Brennan, Joseph F.
 *Burch, Maxie B.
 *Coward, William G., Jr.
 *Ferguson, Edmond B.
 *Finn, Daniel E.
 *Garver, Frank E.
 *Healer, Carl T.
 *Hunsicker, David S.
 *Jordan, Richard E.
 *Leflis, Leslie M.
 *McDonnell, Francis W.
 *Mignone, John C.
 *Muenzler, Leroy E., Jr.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Alexander, Robert E.
 *Allgaier, Donald D.
 *Bednar, George J.
 *Bodamer, James E.
 *Boennighausen, Thomas L.
 *Bolinger, Donald S.
 *Carden, Orelan R., Jr.
 *Carter, Robert L.
 *Caughman, James B., Jr.
 *Cervinka, Norman L.
 *Chin, William
 *Christenson, Carl E.
 *Christenson, James E.
 *Christiansen, Von O.
 *Connor, William C.
 *Cook, Jan W.
 *Corley, Wentworth H., Jr.
 *Dallam, Michael M.
 *Devicq, David C.
 *Donovan, Lawrence K.
 *Dozier, Herbert L., Jr.
 *Engle, Richard M.
 *Filbry, Herman W.
 *Fort, Arthur W.
 *Frevert, Edward C., Jr.
 *Gibowicz, Charles J., Jr.
 *Gilmore, Gordon R.
 *Harkless, Gerald A.
 *Harned, David W.
 *Harrell, Haywood H.
 *Hartman, Paul K.
 *Harwell, Thomas W.
 *Holmes, Henry A.

*Tatten, Richard J.
 *Tilley, Philip L.
 *Tyree, David M., Jr.
 *Underhill, Edward B.
 *Upton, Thomas H., Jr.
 *Vann, Louis E.
 *Vanni, Ralph J.
 *Vincent, Howard A.
 *Vinson, Johnnie H.
 *Walker, Paul D.
 *Wardrup, Leo C., Jr.
 *Wareham, Harry B.
 *Warren, Raymond
 *Watson, Junior J.
 *Weaver, Johnnie R.
 *Webster, Harry G.
 *Welzbacker, Peter J.
 *Werbel, Samuel G.
 *West, Jay F.
 *Wheeler, Hugh H.
 *Willingham, David G.
 *Winn, Frank N.
 *Wondergem, Hugo C., Jr.
 *Worth, George W.
 *Wrobel, Eugene A.
 *Wyatt, John M.
 *Young, Gerald H.
 *Zanetti, Allen G.

DENTAL CORPS

Abeyta, Edward L.
 Back, Jim P.
 Bass, Ernest B., Jr.
 Beck, Ralph A., Jr.
 Begg, John F.
 Bell, Walter C.
 Bies, Peter E.
 Canal, John W.
 Carmody, Robert B.
 Charbonneau, Paul C.
 Clark, George E.
 Copeland, Richard A.
 Cunningham, Peter R.
 II
 Curtice, Frederick A.
 Debs, John F.
 Donoho, Donald H.
 *Flynn, Dennis D.
 *Glazer, Sanford A.
 *Grisham, John P.
 Groat, Jack E.
 *Groff, Gordon B.
 Habig, Louis C.
 *Hurst, Thomas L.
 Johnston, William C.
 Kepley, Benjamin F.
 Leonard, Edward P.
 Longenecker, David P.
 Luhtala, Jay L.
 Maastricht, William H.
 Mach, Joseph S.
 *MacPherson, John H.
 *McCoy, Richard B.
 *McLaughlin, William E.
 Mohr, Richard W.
 Morris, "M" Dan
 Oldfield, Ronald E.
 Regan, Paul F.
 *Russell, Harold L.
 Sabala, Clyde L.
 Salmon, Thomas N.
 Scorrille, Donald L.
 Siracuse, Joseph T.
 *Skyberg, Russell L.
 Smith, Cameron M.
 *Smith, Carl J.
 *Stefl, Charles T.
 Switala, Robert G.
 Vath, Charles R.
 *Wickford, Richard W.
 Young, Guy E.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Anderson, Walter C.
 *Angelo, Lewis E.
 Baker, George F., Jr.
 Bender, Allen E.
 Brown, Charles R.
 *Bullard, Henry B.
 *Cannady, John W., Jr.
 Celeste, Vincent J.
 Chipman, Albion P.
 Comfort, Gerald G., Sr.
 Corder, James E.
 *Crodick, William J.
 Dewitt, James E.
 Elfstrom, Berger R., Jr.
 *Fanning, Graydon E.
 *Ford, Gerald R.
 Hodges, Richard C.
 Hussey, Theodore A.
 Keller, Eugene R.
 King, William U.
 *Kovarik, Clifford V.
 Lakey, Dean E.
 *Law, Malcolm K.
 Livingston, Donald K.
 Madison, Howard D.
 *McIntyre, Max N.
 McNair, Harold E.
 *Mulvey, Joseph R.
 *Owen, Ivan B.
 *Perry, Vernon P.
 *Redding, Francis J.
 Richards, William E., Jr.
 Scott, Floyd C., Jr.
 Sheddlosky, Albert F.
 Smith, Fred E.
 *Smith, Robert W.
 Ustick, Leo A.
 Waters, Carl R.
 *White, Sheldon A.
 *Woodard, Charlene J.

NURSE CORPS

*Agnew, Lynnette A.
 *Allen, Janet N.
 Barnes, Julia O.
 *Bushley, Nancy L.
 *Calloway, Emily F.
 *Chaffin, Barbara C.
 *Clayton, Irish B.
 *Craig, Anne S.
 *Frates, Virginia M.
 *Hudson, Marilyn R.
 *Kelly, Joann P.
 *Kelly, Mary
 Kiely, Sally A.
 *Leonard, Mary J.
 *Lundquist, Nancy L.
 *Lynch, Marie A.
 *Lyons, Barbara A.
 *Matuszewski, Barbara R.
 *Nelson, Marijean V.
 *O'Neill, Elizabeth
 *Orofino, Gloria A.
 *Reiner, Joan
 *Sasser, Georgiarene
 *Scherer, Carolyn E.
 *Schrock, Doris M.
 *Sowash, Patricia A.
 *Spellman, Georgia E.
 *Stelzer, Kathleen
 *Stuart, Irene M.
 *Sullivan, Elinor M.
 *Uebel, Donna J.
 *Ueblicker, Martha M.
 *Watson, Beverly A.
 *Weldt, Bew P., II
 *Wohlgemuth, Janet C.
 *Zens, Nadine A.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT, LINE

*Abbey, Clifton R.
 *Abbey, Donald L.
 *Abbott, Richard L.
 Abel, Ernest W.
 *Abell, Terry A.
 *Abelon, Asher D.
 *Abrams, Steven S.
 *Ackland, Thomas B.
 *Adair, Roy E., Jr.
 *Adams, Charles E.
 *Adams, Gary R.
 *Adams, Phillip A.
 *Adams, Richard E.
 *Adell, James M.
 *Aeberli, Edwin G.
 Agle, Roy L.
 *Ahlborn, Edward R., Jr.
 *Alford, John W.
 *Allitt, Bruce D.
 *Allard, Richard L.
 *Allen, James F.
 *Allen, Leslie F.
 *Allen, Ralph H.

*Allen, Thomas R.
 *Allin, John W.
 *Allison, Dennis P.
 *Allison, William S., III
 *Almond, John W., Jr.
 *Ames, Frederick F.
 *Amos, Robert E.
 *Amundsen, Rickard O., Jr.
 *Anawalt, Richard A.
 *Anciaux, Louis N.
 *Andersen, Franklyn D.
 *Anderson, David J.
 *Anderson, David C.
 *Anderson, David M.
 *Anderson, Ross K., Jr.
 *Anderson, Richard G.
 *Anderson, Richard L.
 *Anderson, Sanford C.
 *Anderson, William G. W.
 Andrew, Dall H.
 *Andrews, James R.
 *Aquilzap, Bruce F.
 *Arvedlund, Richard L.
 *Ardizzone, Robert L.
 *Armstrong, Arthur J., Jr.
 *Arndt, William D.
 *Arnold, John P.
 *Arnold, William T.
 *Asher, John W., III
 *Aston, Albert H., Jr.
 *Astor, Lawrence R.
 *Athanson, John W.
 *Atkinson, Larry R.
 *Aucella, John P.
 *Auer, James E.
 *Aulenbach, Thomas H.
 *Avery, Donald W., Jr.
 *Ayer, Donald E.
 *Ayer, Lewis E., Jr.
 *Bachmann, Richard G.
 *Backe, Donald J.
 *Baffer, Roger A.
 *Bafico, Richard E.
 *Bailey, Leonard R.
 *Bailey, Thomas A.
 *Baker, David J.
 *Baker, David A.
 *Baldwin, Gary A.
 *Ballan, Alexander G.
 *Ball, Harry F., Jr.
 *Ball, Richard H.
 *Ball, Robert H.
 *Balliet, Norman L.
 *Baltutis, John S., Jr.
 *Banda, Lionel A. W.
 *Barat, Charles A.
 *Barber, Samuel R.
 *Barber, Stanley D.
 *Barg, Mark S.
 *Barker, Ross D.
 *Barlow, Wayne C.
 *Barnes, Edwin R.
 *Barnes, Stanton J.
 *Barney, William C.
 *Barron, John M.
 *Barrow, Edward M., Jr.
 *Barry, Duane E.
 *Barstad, Willis A.
 *Barthel, Donald A.
 *Barthelme, Karl T., Jr.
 *Bartol, John H., Jr.
 *Barton, Creighton E.
 *Barton, Edmond C.
 *Bartz, Harry A.
 *Batchelder, Charles M.
 *Bates, Billy G.
 *Batterman, Dean H.
 *Batzel, Thomas J.
 *Baucom, William E.
 *Bauer, Wayne E.
 *Baumgart, Stephen W.
 *Baumhofer, William J.
 *Baxter, George R.
 *Bean, Charles D.
 *Beard, Travis N.
 *Beasley, Max H., Jr.
 *Beaudry, Rodolphe W.
 *Beaver, Jerald C.
 *Bechtel, Donald G., Sr.
 *Bechthold, George W.
 *Beck, Fernand P., III
 *Beck, Melvin D.
 *Beckham, Robert F.
 *Bedard, Albert
 *Bedford, John L.
 *Beers, Robert N.
 *Behrman, Richard W.
 *Belakjon, Ivan
 *Beland, Conrad L.
 *Belew, Carson T.
 *Bell, Corwin A.
 *Bell, Denis J. W.
 *Bell, Henry L., Jr.
 *Bell, Richard M.
 *Bellamy, Gary S.
 *Beltz, Ivan L.
 *Benchea, Traian
 *Bender, John C.
 *Benington, George A.
 *Bennet, David H., Jr.
 *Bennett, Denis F.
 *Bennett, Edmond B.
 *Bennett, Franklin L.
 *Bennett, Gary P.
 *Bennett, Robert L.
 *Bennett, Walter D.
 *Benson, Jeffrey L.
 *Benson, Milo E.
 *Benson, Richard E.
 *Beranek, Bernard F., II
 *Berg, Carl R.
 *Berkebile, Jack
 *Bernardy, Benjamin V.
 *Bernstein, William P., II
 *Berry, Earl, Jr.
 *Berry, Russell E., Jr.
 *Berry, William
 *Betancourt, Raymond E.
 *Beverstock, William L.
 *Bignell, James P.
 *Binckes, Jeffrey B.
 *Biro, Michael R.
 *Bishop, Donald E.
 *Bishop, Samuel E.
 *Blacksmith, Jack E.
 *Blackwell, Cecil L.
 *Blalock, Jack N.
 *Blessing, Albert C., Jr.
 *Blomberg, Charles L.
 *Boak, Charles W.
 *Bogle, William J. B.
 *Bohley, Carl M.
 *Bolan, Robert S., Jr.
 *Boldt, David E.
 *Boley, John R.
 *Bonar, James W.
 *Bond, "C" Ward, Jr.
 *Bond, Robert J.
 *Bonsignore, Michael R.
 *Booth, Carter
 *Borlet, Robert A.
 *Botten, Leroy H.
 *Bourgeois, Roberty A.
 *Bowen, Andrew J., IV
 *Bowen, Ralph W., Jr.
 *Bowen, William E.

- *Bowes, William C.
 *Bowman, Thomas E., III
 Boyd, Alton L.
 *Boyd, John H.
 *Boyd, Ronald A.
 *Boyen, Richard E.
 *Boyeson, Mathew G.
 *Bruce, Hance R.
 *Bruce, John H.
 *Bruce, Richard J.
 Brumgard, Donald P.
 Bruns, Frederick W.
 *Bracken, William J., Jr.
 *Bracy, Michael B.
 *Bradford, William E.
 Brady, Carl E.
 Brady, Charles R.
 *Brahmer, Frederick E.
 *Brandt, Dale E.
 *Brandt, Thomas K.
 Branson, Bascomb E.
 *Bratton, Charles S.
 Braun, Farrell J.
 Brearton, Gerald A.
 *Breen, Alfred L., Jr.
 *Breithaupt, David E.
 *Brems, Richard A.
 *Brent, Melvin C.
 Breslin, John W.
 *Brett, James R.
 Brewer, Joe R.
 *Brickman, Edward P.
 *Bridgeman, Robert J.
 Bridges, Benny C.
 Bridges, Elisha M., Jr.
 *Briggs, Steven R.
 *Brinkley, William S.
 Brinson, Jack E.
 *Briski, Richard J.
 *Brittingham, Edward M.
 Brockbank, Dean O.
 *Brockman, Edward B.
 *Brockmeier, Robert O.
 *Broder, William T.
 *Brodie, Reid, III
 *Broesamle, Robert R.
 *Brokaw, Charles R.
 *Brooks Paul A.
 *Brookshire, Marshall L.
 *Brouger, William S.
 Brouwer, Federick P., II
 *Brown, Charles E., Jr.
 Brown, Jerry B.
 Brown, Larence H.
 Brown, Paul F.
 *Brown, William C., III
 *Browne, Peter A.
 *Browne, Vernon G.
 *Buck, Earl F.
 *Buckingham, Duane W.
 Buckius, Donald E.
 *Buckley, John T.
 *Buckley, Robert F., Jr.
 *Buckley, Thomas D.
 *Buell, Kenneth R.
 *Buelow, Richard W.
 *Buescher, Stephen M.
 *Bugg, William E.
 *Bullard, Walter M., Jr.
 *Bunce, Richard L.
 *Bunnell, Melvin L.
 *Burke, Bruce
 *Burke, James E.
 *Burke, John P.
 *Burke, Michael E.
 *Burnett, Robert V.
 *Burnham, John L.
 *Burns, James E.
 *Burns, John P., Jr.
 *Burriss, Robert N.
 *Burroughs, Lawrence D.
 Buse, Carol R.
 *Busemeyer, David G.
 *Bustamante, Charles J.
 *Butler, Edward J.
 *Butler, Francis W.
 *Butler, Gary W.
 Butler, James N., Jr.
 Buttrick, Robert E.
 Buzhardt, William P.
 *Byrd, Leon E.
 *Byrnes, David T.
 *Byrnes, Richard P.
 *Byster, Martin B.
 Coker, David J.
 *Calande, John J., Jr.
 *Calhoun, Ronald J.
 *Calvano, Charles N.
 *Cameron, John R.
 *Campbell, Brian F.
 *Campbell, Cletus L.
 *Campbell, David R.
 *Campbell, Robert L.
 *Campbell, William H., Jr.
 *Cantele, John A.
 *Cardinal, Peter P.
 *Carey, Michael T.
 *Cargill, Lee B.
 *Carl, Lester W.
 Carley, Edward A.
 Carlier, James F.
 *Carlsen, Kenneth L.
 *Carmichael, William R.
 Carnley, Beauron L.
 *Carr, Michael R.
 *Carrie, James J., Jr.
 Carrington, Alfred P.
 *Carroll, Joseph F.
 *Carrothers, Peter C.
 *Carter, Clyde L.
 *Carter, James O.
 Carter, William L.
 Carty, Claud E.
 *Castro, John
 Cate, Eugene N., Jr.
 Caverly, Richard W.
 Ceckuth, Richard E.
 *Celebrezze, Anthony J.
 *Chambers, William J.
 *Chandler, Fred G.
 *Chapman, Austin E.
 Chatellier, Richard T.
 Chermowski, John A.
 *Cherry, Richard B.
 Cheyne, Robert H., Jr.
 *Chidister, William T.
 *Childers, Houston
 *Chrane, "R" "V"
 *Christensen, Steven R.
 *Christensen, Donald W.
 Christensen, Charles L.
 *Christie, John B., II
 *Ciszewski, Robert A.
 *Clair, Robert A.
 *Clark, Arthur D.
 *Clark, Christopher M.
 Clark, Dale V.
 *Clark, Dennis M.
 Clark, Jackie L.
 *Clark, John B.
 *Clark, Ralph B., Jr.
 *Clark, Robert B.
 *Clark, Robert A.
 *Clarke, Charles E.
 Clarke, Gary D.
 *Clarke, Wayne A.
 *Claybrook, Sam
 *Clemen, Leroy J.
 *Clements, Billy J.
 *Cloninger, Arthur D.
 *Coates, David B.
 *Cochran, Frederick F.
 Cochran, William M.
 *Cockrell, Milford N., Jr.
 *Cohen, William D.
 Colburn, Herbert T.
 *Coleman, Robert H.
 *Collier, Robert L.
 *Collins, Alfred L., Jr.
 Collins, James A.
 *Collins, Joseph S.
 *Colnaghi, George L.
 *Colston, Michael G.
 Colthurst, Wallace R.
 Colvin, Clarence E.
 *Colyer, John M., Jr.
 *Conley, Dennis R.
 *Connaughton, James B.
 *Connell, James R.
 Connell, James E.
 Connolly, John J.
 Conner, Bryan T.
 *Connor, Harry M., Jr.
 *Connor, John P.
 *Conrad, Thomas M.
 *Conroy, John D.
 *Cook, Chandler L.
 *Cook, Charles J.
 *Cook, Donald E., Jr.
 *Cook, Eugene E.
 *Cook, James A.
 *Cook, John F., Jr.
 *Cook, Joseph T.
 *Cook, Raymond L.
 *Cook, Richard P.
 *Cooley, Leslie W.
 *Copeland, Robert L.
 *Coppenger, Carl J.
 Cordine, John F., Jr.
 *Corgan, Michael T.
 *Cornett, George G.
 *Cornish, David O.
 Corsette, Richard B.
 *Costarakis, Dennis A.
 *Coulter, William L.
 Counts, Jimmie A.
 *Counts, William A.
 *Cox, Landon G., Jr.
 Crusoe, John A.
 *Craig, Leon H.
 *Craig, Philip C.
 *Crane, Mark F.
 Crane, Richard W.
 Crawford, Charles R.
 Crawford, Gaston L.
 *Cressy, Peter H.
 *Crews, Everett
 *Cribley, James M.
 *Criste, Russell E.
 *Criswell, William T., II
 *Cronin, Michael P.
 *Crcnin, Robert R.
 Cross, William A.
 *Cruse, John A.
 *Cunha, George D. M.
 Currier, John N.
 *Curtin, Andrew J.
 *Curtis, Donald L.
 Cushman, William N., Jr.
 Cusson, Lyle H.
 *Czerwonky, James H.
 *Dabich, Eli, Jr.
 *Dade, Thomas B.
 Dahlvig, Alan L.
 Daisley, Richard A.
 Dalager, Neil R.
 *Dale, Vernon A.
 Dalton, George E.
 *Dalton, Henry F.
 Danklevitch, Robert J.
 Danza, Robert S.
 *Daramus, Nicholas T., Jr.
 *Darrow, Lester M.
 *Daugherty, Shaun M.
 *Daughters, Milo P., II
 *Daunis, Alexander B.
 *Davey, Francis L., Jr.
 Davidson, David L.
 *Davidson, Edward R.
 *Davidson, Wayne F.
 *Davis, Henry H., Jr.
 *Davis, Lee A.
 *Davis, Robert D.
 Davis, Stephen B., Jr.
 Davis, Theron L.
 *Davis, Walter H.
 *Dawes, David R.
 *Day, Patrick A.
 *Dean, Philip W.
 *Dean, Victor E.
 *Deboer, James K.
 *Decaril, Wiley P.
 *Deforth, Peter W.
 Defries, Melton E.
 *Degollan, Felix E., III
 *Dehnert, Charles E.
 *Deklever, Vaughn G.
 *Delaney, John T.
 *Delgaizo, Theodore J.
 *Delong, James J.
 Denbow, Kenneth D.
 Denlea, Edward P.
 *Dennis, James A., Jr.
 *Dennis, Lorin A.
 *Deprey, Allan W.
 Derby, William T., Jr.
 *Dermyer, William D.
 *Dersham, Earle R.
 *Desantis, Antonio F.
 Deselms, Veri D.
 Destefano, Frank J., Jr.
 *Detrick, Ernest M., II
 *Detweiler, John H.
 *Deutermann, Peter T.
 *Devine, David L.
 Devanny, Richard A.
 *Dias, Richard E.
 *Dibari, Charles C.
 *Dick, Albert G.
 *Dick, Allen H.
 *Dick, Charles D.
 *Dickson, Ray R.
 *Dielen, Walter J.
 *Dietz, Francis H., Jr.
 *Dill, Walter S.
 Diller, Marion H., II
 Dillon, Leo G.
 *Dimeling, William R.
 *Ditto, Anthony P.
 *Divoky, Wayne F.
 *Dixon, Robert L.
 *Dixon, Ronald R.
 *Doherty, Dennis C.
 Dolan, Harold A.
 *Doll, Lawrence A.
 *Donahue, Drake A.
 *Donegan, John J., Jr.
 *Donelan, John O.
 *Donovan, Charles A., Jr.
 *Dorman, Merrill H.
 *Dorminey, David H.
 *Dorrenbacher, John S.
 *Dougherty, Alfred F.
 *Dow, Walter O.
 *Dowdy, James W.
 *Downs, James A.
 *Downs, William E.
 *Doyle, James P.
 *Doyle, William J., III
 *Drake, Keland L., Jr.
 *Drake, Neil H.
 *Draper, William H.
 *Driesbach, Ronald E.
 *Driscoll, Kurt A.
 *Driscoll, Richard F.
 Droll, Joseph A.
 *Dronzek, Henry F.
 Dubois, Vern A.
 *Duke, James R.
 *Duke, William R., Jr.
 *Dukes, Raymond D.
 *Dulz, Gerald D.
 Dunbar, Perry J.
 Duncan, Donald G.
 *Duncan, Stephen M.
 *Dunn, Michael J.
 *Dunn, Michael E.
 *Durfee, David L.
 Durnan, Patrick A.
 *Duskin, Douglas J.
 Dutcher, William E.
 Dyches, Fred D.
 *Dye, William R.
 *Dyer, George H.
 *Dykes, Richard A.
 *Earner, William A., Jr.
 *Earnhardt, John B.
 *Eastman, Kenneth O., Jr.
 *Eastman, Robert L.
 *Ebel, Paul E.
 *Ebert, David J.
 *Eckert, John
 *Eckert, Raymond A.
 *Eckles, James W.
 *Eddy, Charles P., III
 *Eder, Anton A.
 *Edge, Jacob, II
 Edmiston, James B.
 *Edrington, Frank R., II
 *Edwards, Donald W.
 *Edwards, Joseph W.
 *Eissing, Frank E., III
 Elkins, Rodger N.
 *Ellis, David M.
 *Ellis, Richard H.
 *Ellis, Samuel H.
 *Ellison, William T.
 *Elmore, Samuel B.
 *Elrod, Stephen, A.
 *Elshoff, Jay E.
 *Emery, George W.
 *Emmerson, Vernon D.
 *Emrich, Roger G.
 *Engler, John G.
 Erwin, Arthur R.
 *Erlandson, John L., Sr.
 *Ettel, Edward E., III
 Evans, Floyd
 Evans, Gerald D.
 *Eve, Edward A., III
 *Eversole, Bary L.
 *Ewing, Ronald W.
 *Faddis, Jack H.
 *Faircloth, George B., Jr.
 *Fairfax, Perry C.
 *Fallat, Thomas J.
 Farabaugh, Clark R.
 *Farkas, Daniel P.
 *Farrell, Richard M.
 *Farrell, Thomas J.
 *Farrin, George P.
 *Farris, Wayne R.
 Fasking, Floyd E.
 Faubion, Richard R.
 *Featherstone, Peter A.
 Feedback, Ralph S.
 *Felice, Anthony J., Jr.
 *Felps, Lowell D.
 *Felsenthal, Edward G.
 *Felte, James F.
 *Fenner, David L.
 *Ferencie, Steven H., Jr.
 *Ferguson, Gary W.
 *Ferguson, Lawrence L.
 Ferguson, Robert L.
 Ferguson, Robert D.
 *Ferquerson, James O.
 *Fetterhoff, Charles E.
 *Fields, James R.
 *Fields, Joseph H.
 Finch, Welford V.
 Finley, John C.
 *Flori, Mario P.
 *Fischer, John N., Jr.
 *Fishburn, Charles G.
 *Fister, George R.
 *Fitzgerald, William C.
 *Fitzgerald, Cecil M.
 *Fitzgerald, John E.
 *Fitzmaurice, Cornelius A., Jr.
 *Flanagan, Chester
 *Flatley, William F.
 *Flavell, William A.
 *Fleeger, Russell B.
 *Fleming, Richard T.
 *Flynn, William M.
 *Fobes, Robert W., Jr.
 *Fogel, Wayne A., II
 Fones, James, M., Jr.
 *Fontana, James D.
 *Foshee, Terry W.
 *Ford, Jack C.
 *Ford, Robert A., Jr.
 Forgey, Leroy A.
 *Forster, Robert D.
 *Fossella, Joseph F.
 *Foust, James E., III
 Foxwell, Robert E.
 *Franklin, Allyn R.
 *Franklin, Ted G.
 *Franson, Alvin L.
 Frantz, Philip L.
 Fraser, Douglas F.
 *Fratello, Thomas F., II
 *Frazier, Paul D.
 *Frazier, Gordon, T., Jr.
 Freels, Homer J.
 *Freeman, Ernest R.
 Freeman, John S.
 *Freeman, Rufus A.
 *Freese, Donald R.
 *Freibert, Ralph W.
 *French, Charles E.
 Frenzing, Thomas W., II
 *Friedman, John D.
 Fritz, Thomas C.
 *Frost, David E.
 *Fujimoto, Toshio
 *Fuller, Jack E.
 *Furgerson, Ronald M.
 *Furniss, Peter R.
 *Gaines, George L.
 *Gaines, John F. A.
 *Gainor, John W., III
 *Gallagher, Gerald R., Jr.
 Gallagher, Tilden M., Jr.
 *Galm, Lawrence F.
 *Garber, Jan W.
 *Garcia, Abel A.
 *Gard, Albert W., III
 *Garde, James C.
 *Gardiner, Peter C.
 *Gardner, Jay M.
 *Gardner, John H., III
 *Gareffa, Joseph J.
 *Garrett, Daniel L.
 Garrett, Hubert R.
 Garrett, Thomas C.
 *Gates, Jonathan H.
 *Gautier, James B.
 *Gavin, Gerald R.
 Geddes, James J.
 *Geissler, Richard F.
 *Geller, Robert E.
 *Generous, William T., Jr.
 *Gentile, Willard J.
 *Genung, Edward N., Jr.
 *Georgius, David R.
 Geppert, Robert C.
 *Gerber, Dean E.
 *Gerber, Raymond
 *Glanakos, Demetrios G.
 *Gibbons, Michael F., Jr.
 *Gibbs, Anthony W.
 Gibbs, Maurice E.
 *Gibson, Louis S., III
 *Gibson, Raymond O., Jr.
 *Giddens, Robert G., Jr.
 Gilbert, James D.
 *Gilbert, Jerry D.
 *Giles, James M.
 Gilkeson, Louis L.

- *Gill, Daniel J.
*Gill, James E.
Gillette, Ronald V.
Gilpin, Girard H.
*Gilroy, Vincent J., Jr.
*Glaes, Roger B.
*Glass, Arnold L.
*Glassner, Arnold
*Gleason, Carroll F.
Glenn, Danny E.
*Glowinski, Stanley V.
Godbehere, Richard G.
*Goff, William G., Jr.
*Gonzales, Roy A.
*Goodgame, Billy D.
*Gooding, William B., Jr.
Goodlett, Wallace D.
*Goodloe, Robert V., Jr.
*Goodridge, William W.
*Goodson, Jimmie
*Goodwin, Albert O.
*Goodwin, Edward F., Jr.
Gore, Milton B.
*Gosnell, Charles E.
*Gost, Evans G.
Gough, Charles R.
*Gould, Robert J.
Gould, William G.
*Grace, Harry T., Jr.
Graft, George W.
*Graham, Charles N., Jr.
*Graham, David S.
*Graham, Edward N.
*Graham, John E., Jr.
*Graham, Lawrence L., Jr.
Gramer, Constantine J.
*Grant, Donald E.
*Grantham, Wiley G.
*Graves, George W., Jr.
Grawrock, Thomas W., Jr.
*Gray, Joseph H., Jr.
*Grayson, Thomas H.
*Greaber, Thomas C.
Green, Douglas A.
*Green, Forrest B.
*Green, Thomas R.
*Greene, David L.
*Greene, John F.
*Greenelsen, David P.
Greenwood, James A.
Greeson, Tommy D.
*Gregory, Francis C.
*Gregory, Richard O.
*Greiner, Paul T.
*Grice, Leroy
*Grider, George W., Jr.
*Griffin, John C.
*Griffin, Keith H.
*Griffin, Lloyd W.
*Griffith, Clyde E.
*Grillo, Pat L.
*Gross, Lawrence R.
*Gross, Stephen G.
*Grossman, Arthur J., Jr.
*Grover, Harold R.
*Gubbins, Philip S.
*Guest, George R.
*Gufey, Richard E.
*Gunn, William T., III
*Gustafson, William C.
*Guthrie, Stephen D.
Hackett, Charles R.
Hadley, William R.
*Haeni, Frederick P.
*Hahn, William D.
*Haines, Douglas M.
*Hall, Billy L.
*Hall, Edward M.
*Hall, James R.
*Hall, Thomas F.
*Hall, William L.
*Hailigan, James R.
*Hallowes, David M.
*Hamilton, Alonzo R.
*Hamilton, William J., IV
*Hand, James R.
*Haney, Tom B.
*Hankey, Earle W.
*Hanks, Paul W.
*Hanley, James J.
*Hansen, Carl K.
*Hansen, William L.
*Hanson, Donald E.
*Hanson, Orville O.
*Hanson, Wayne L.
*Hanson, William T.
*Hardaway, Edward V., II
*Hardwick, Hal H., Jr.
*Hardy, William D.
*Hare, Floyd D.
*Hare, John A.
*Harken, Jerry L.
*Harman, Michael J.
*Harness, Francis W.
*Harper, Robert L.
*Harris, Ben W.
*Harris, Jon R.
*Harris, Wilson F., Jr.
*Harrison, Dennis A.
*Harrison, Robert W., Jr.
*Hart, Ronald J.
*Hartford, Edward S.
*Hartman, Richard H.
Harvey, Dean H.
*Harvey, John M.
*Harvey, Timothy R.
*Harwell, Edgar A.
*Haskins, Leslie E.
*Haslet, William J.
*Hassler, Bernard B.
*Hathaway, Clarence M.
*Hauhart, James N.
*Hauser, Warren A.
*Hayes, Cornelius C., Jr.
*Hazlip, Oscar H.
*Heathwood, Desmond J.
Heffernan, Richard F.
*Heggle, Douglas G.
*Heilig, Herbert R.
*Heim, David L.
*Heimbach, Gene G.
*Heimovics, Richard D.
*Heins, Raymond R.
*Hellaewell, "G" Alan, Jr.
*Helsper, Charles F.
Helt, James F.
*Hemphill, Orville A.
*Hendley, Thomas M., Jr.
*Hendon, Jerry E.
Hendricks, Peter L.
*Hendrickson, Kenneth E.
*Henke, Donald V.
*Herbert, Michael J.
*Herman, Klemme L.
*Hermansen, Bruce T.
*Hernandez, Blas P.
*Hershey, Thomas P.
Hess, James D.
*Hess, Lee R.
*Hetzl, William C.
*Hicks, Richard L.
*Hidy, Don R.
*Hieldbrant, Elmer G.
*Higgins, Dean S.
*Higgins, Edward P.
*Higgins, Robert W.
*High, Lewis C.
*Highland, Jeffrey A.
*Hill, Richard D.
*Hillis, Robert J.
*Hilton, Francis W., Jr.
Hilton, Jay I.
*Himchak, William A.
*Hinchliffe, Frederick, II
Hinds, James J.
*Hines, Ronald D.
*Hirsch, Henry C.
Hitchcock, Terrence W.
Hitt, Joe T.
*Hoag, Raymond A.
*Hobbs, Marvin E.
*Hobdy, William B.
Hodge, Carl A.
*Hoeftling, William A., II
*Hofer, James H.
*Hoff, Robert G.
*Hoffman, Calhoun E., III
*Hoffman, Carl W.
*Hogan, James J., III
*Hohlsteln, Julian G.
*Holvik, Thomas H.
Hokanson, Anders, Jr.
Holden, Harry F., Jr.
*Hollenack, William R.
Holliday, Harley J.
*Hollis, Jan M.
*Hollister, Jack D.
*Holme, Thomas T., Jr.
*Holmes, David F.
*Holmes, Frank C.
*Honhart, David C.
*Hood, David J.
*Hood, John M., Jr.
Hood, John T.
*Hooks, Jack D.
*Hoooven, Harry C.
Hoover, Arthur E.
*Hoover, John W., Jr.
*Hopkins, Irvin G., II
*Hopkins, Larry M.
Hopkins, William J.
*Hopkinson, Rodney
Horn, Maurice D., Jr.
*Hornick, James F.
Horst, Rudolph A.
*Hougham, Ronald L.
*Houghton, Hugh J., Jr.
*House, William L.
Houser, Ralph B., Jr.
*Howard, David B., Jr.
*Howe, Thomas K.
*Howell, George C.
Howell, Melvin C.
*Howerton, Floyd E.
*Hoy, Stephen G.
*Huchting, George A.
*Hucks, Jerry P.
*Hudak, Roger J.
*Hudson, Joel L.
*Huffman, Kenneth A.
Huggins, Delbert R.
*Hughes, William C., Jr.
*Hullings, Joseph S., III
*Hull, John J.
*Hulquist, Raymond G., Jr.
Hulsey, Vernon C.
*Hulsey, Virgil G.
Hummell, Kenneth A.
Hunt, Clark H.
*Hunt, James C., II
Hunt, Rex E.
Hunter, Robert S.
*Hurst, Edwin K., II
Hurt, Lonnie W.
*Huselson, Berten J.
*Huss, Jerry F.
*Hutcheson, James E., Jr.
*Hutchins, Guy J.
*Hutchins, Richard H.
Hutt, Gordon W.
*Hutter, George R.
*Huxel, Lawrence L.
*Hyland, Richard J.
*Hynes, William R.
*Tannone, Niles A.
*Iber, William R.
Ingram, Luther G., Jr.
*Ingram, William H., Jr.
*Isger, Albert A.
*Itkin, Richard I.
*Jackson, John E.
*Jackson, Marshall N.
*Jackson, Robert P.
*Jackson, Robert W.
*Jackson, Thomas D.
*Jacobs, Donald E.
*Jacqmim, Michael R.
James, Daniel A.
*James, David R.
James, Robert N.
*Jameson, Clarence H., Jr.
*Jammick, Bill P.
Janssen, Kenneth L.
*Jara, Paul T.
*Jarvis, Ronald A.
*Jaudon, Joel B.
*Jeffries, John W.
*Jelley, James A.
*Jenkins, Alan K.
*Jenkinson, William R.
*Jerard, Albert B., III
*Jerr, Richard F.
*Johns, William P.
*Johnson, Allan E.
*Johnson, Allan L.
*Johnson, Alan F.
*Johnson, Arne E.
*Johnson, Charles P.
*Johnson, Charles E.
*Johnson, Donald D.
*Johnson, Earl P.
*Johnson, Gerard G.
*Johnson, Hartle E.
*Johnson, Patrick W.
*Johnson, Ralph G.
*Johnson, Robert T.
*Johnson, William S.
*Johnson, William S., Jr.
*Johnston, Raymond A.
Jokela, Carl R.
*Jones, Dennis R.
Jones, Edward A.
Jones, James V.
*Jones, Jeffrey B.
Jones, Jerome C.
*Jones, Johnnie
*Jones, Martin J.
*Jones, Robert C.
*Jones, Thomas H., Jr.
*Jones, Thomas E.
*Jordan, James D.
*Jordan, Jerry W.
*Jordan, John F., Jr.
*Jordan, John A.
*Jordan, Stephen B.
*Jordan, Wesley E., Jr.
Judd, Raymond J.
*Justice, Donald
Kafka, William J.
*Kahn, William M.
*Kahrs, "J" Henry, III
*Kaiser, Frederick H., Jr.
*Kaiser, John M.
*Kajdan, Lawrence J.
*Kallestad, John R.
*Kaman, William J.
*Kammann, Richard W.
*Kane, Richard E., Jr.
*Karabasz, Felix F.
Karnes, Oliver J.
*Karr, Kenneth R.
*Karson, Jack L.
*Kaup, Karl L.
*Kearns, Robert J., III
*Kearse, James G.
*Keefe, Gary L.
*Keel, Donald P., Jr.
*Keeler, Robert W.
*Keen, Walter R.
*Keenan, Robert W.
*Keene, Russell A., Jr.
Keith, Roy E.
*Keltz, David A.
*Kell, Richard E.
*Keller, James H.
Kelley, Bernard J., Jr.
*Kennedy, John E., Jr.
*Keown, Marcus G., II
*Keppel, William J.
*Kerley, James B.
Kern, Robert D.
Keselica, Michael N.
Kessler, William E.
*Key, Albert W.
*Key, Wilson D.
*Kidder, Donnell R.
Knight, Ben
*Killian, James E.
*Kilmer, Ronald W.
*Kinderman, Lawrence W.
King, Carl
*King, George L., Jr.
*Kinnear, Richard J.
*Kinney, Dan L.
*Kircheval, John H., Jr.
*Kirk, Gary L.
*Kirkpatrick, Max H.
*Kirkus, John G.
Kissick, Ronald W.
*Kitterman, Harry L.
*Kiviranna, Henno
*Klemick, Ronald J.
*Klose, William F., II
*Knight, John M.
*Knowles, Kenneth A., Jr.
*Knudsen, Edward H.
*Knudsen, Kenneth M.
*Koczur, Daniel J.
Koehler, Richard K.
*Koehn, James R.
*Koerner, Robert
*Koester, Marlin L.
*Kolon, Carl S.
*Konold, David W., Jr.
*Kordons, Uldis
*Kotowski, Joseph E.
*Kottke, Robert A., Jr.
*Kovel, Stephen H.
*Kozak, Karl M.
*Kozlewicz, Michael R.
*Kraker, Thomas P., Jr.
*Kramer, Alfred V.
*Krause, Michael S.
*Kredler, Leo A.
*Kreinik, Eugene G.
*Kretlow, Orland L.
*Kremkau, Frederick W.
*Kremple, Robert D.
*Kreutziger, Karl G.
Krick, Richard A.
*Krieger, Eric W.
*Kriesen, Arthur J.
*Kriewall, John A.
*Krishfield, Robert C.
*Krohne, Theodore K.
*Krueger, Robert W.
*Krueger, Rudolph V.
*Kruse, Harry R.
*Kuhn, Nicholas D.
*Kuhns, John M.
*Kuneman, James E.
Kunze, Adolf W. G.
*Kurtz, John M.
*Kutch, Raymond A.
Kyzar, Sammy B.
*Lachata, Donald M.
*Lagassa, Robert E.
*Lamay, Thomas V.
*Lamb, James J.
*Lamberth, Charles L.
*Lancaster, Darriell A.
*Landers, Michael F.
*Landgrebe, James H.
Lane, Charles, Jr.
*Lane, Harold R.
*Lanford, Randall G.
*Lang, James R.
*Langham, George D.
Langley, James E.
*Lankford, Hugh K.
*Lankford, Jimmy G.
*Lapic, Jeffrey R.
Laprevotte, William
*Larson, John C.
Lashley, Lewis
*Lasswell, James B.
Latham, Ralph L.
*Latham, Tobias B., Jr.
*Laury, Glenn P.
*Lawrence, Carl J.
Lawrence, Leland R.
*Laws, Robert D.
*Lawson, Joseph H., Jr.
*Lawyer, Clarence M., III
Leach, Duane K.
Leach, George W.
*Leake, David F.
*Lederer, John C.
*Lederhaas, Joseph
Ledford, Billy J.
*Lee, Richard C.
*Leeke, Howard W., Jr.
*Leemkuil, Karl J.
*Leever, George R.
Legan, Phillip R.
Lehmbeck, William L.
Leighton, Hubert R., Jr.
Lemay, Donald E.
*Lemon, Frank M.
*Lennox, Richard J.
*Lents, John M.
Lentz, Charles P.
*Lenz, Bruce B.
Lepage, Roger H.
*Lepsch, Donald L.
*Lesko, John E.
*Lett, Austin S., Jr.
*Levin, George B.
Lewis, Charles H.
*Lewis, Jerry A.
*Lewis, Jerry A.
Lewis, Ralph W.
*Lewis, Robert J., Jr.
Liedel, George A.
*Lies, Ralph N.
Lilly, David E.
*Lincoln, Walter B., Jr.
*Lindell, Colen R.
*Lindsay, Lowell E.
Lindt, Jimmie L.
*Lingo, Robert W.
Linn, Gall F.
*Linn, Larry E.
Linzay, Herman A.
*Lippert, Lee M.
*Lipplatt, Thomas F.
*Lippy, David E.
*Liston, Danon D.
*Little, Robert D.
*Littlefield, Gaston D.
*Litton, Thomas R.
*Livingston, James E.
*Livingston, Donald J.
*Lockett, Jerry T.
Lockhart, Albert L.
*Logan, Carl F.
Logan, Guy B., Jr.
*Loggans, Albert M.
Long, Charles D.
*Long, Harry H.
*Long, Herman J., Jr.
*Long, William K.

- Longcore, Duane M.
 *Looper, Norman G.
 *Lopiano, Fred J.
 *Lopresti, Samuel J.
 *Lord, William F.
 *Loring, William J.
 *Lork, John D.
 *Lounsbery, William J.
 *Love, Buddy A.
 *Love, George P. III
 *Lovejoy, Edward M.
 *Luce, Charles M., Jr.
 *Lugo, Frank J.
 *Luksich, John W.
 *Lundy, George W., Jr.
 *Lutes, David B.
 *Lybarger, Larry E.
 *Lyles, Edward D.
 *Lynch, Charles S.
 *Lynch, Daniel J. II
 *Lynne, Jimmy S.
 *Lyons, Robert W.
 *Morris, Edward W.
 *Macaleer, Stephen C.
 *MacDonald, Timothy A.
 *Machens, Ronald R.
 *Mackie, Frederick D.
 *MacIn, Charles S.
 *MacPherson, Alvin B.
 *Maddock, George A.
 *Madison, Lynn J.
 *Madura, Donald F.
 *Mahaffy, Lorrence A., Jr.
 *Maier, Robert A.
 *Male, Allen M.
 *Malmros, Michael H.
 *Mangeno, James J.
 *Manjerovic, Nicholas R.
 *Manley, Jerry B.
 *Manley, John F.
 *Manly, Billy J.
 *Manning, Edward F.
 *Maples, David G. III
 *Marchetti, Michael J.
 *Maris, Franklin H.
 *Maris, William L., Jr.
 *Markowitz, Stephen A.
 *Marks, Joseph L.
 *Marlow, Frank J.
 *Marlowe, Gilbert M.
 *Marquardt, Judsen R.
 *Marsden, Phillip S.
 *Marsh, Larry R.
 *Marsh, William L.
 *Marshall, John R.
 *Martin, James W.
 *Martin, Leonard S.
 *Martin, Michael J.
 *Martin, Thomas T.
 *Martinache, Charles G.
 *Martinell, Willie M.
 *Martinsen, Glenn T.
 *Marton, Warren A.
 *Mascitto, Eddy J.
 *Mason, Donald R.
 *Mastrich, Robert R.
 *Mather, David R.
 *Matheson, Norm K.
 *Matheson, Robert E.
 *Mathis, Donald W.
 *Mathis, William W.
 *Matjasko, Louis S.
 *Maulsby, Charles A.
 *Mauney, James H.
 *Maus, Leo D.
 *Mavis, John A.
 *Mayer, John B.
 *Mays, Michael E.
 *Mayton, William T.
 *Maze, Robert G.
 *Mazetis, Gerald R.
 *McAllister, Donald L.
 *McAloney, Frank E.
 *McAloon, Albert J., Jr.
 *McAnally, John A.
 *McBride, Edward F., Jr.
 *McBride, Herbert E.
 *McCabe, John S.
 *McCandless, Walter E.
 *McCann, William R., Jr.
 *McCarthy, Charles B., Jr.
 *McCarthy, Michael J.
 *McClanahan, Jim D.
 *McCleary, Joseph R.
 *McClellan, William D.
 *McClung, Gary L.
 *McCollough, Ralph A.
 *McCord, Dennis M.
 *McCormic, George W.
 *McCown, Marvin L.
 *McCreary, Martin W., Jr.
 *McCrory, Donald L.
 *McCrumb, James B.
 *McDaniel, Robert B.
 *McDermott, Michael N.
 *McDevitt, Michael A.
 *McDonald, Daniel E.
 *McDonald, John J., Jr.
 *McDonald, John E.
 *McDowell, William A.
 *McElroy, James H., Jr.
 *McGee, Vance C., Jr.
 *McGinty, Donald J.
 *McGlothren, Carlos E.
 *McGonagle, Leo E.
 *McGrath, Richard L.
 *McGraw, Floyd M.
 *McGuire, George F.
 *McGuire, Kenneth R.
 *McIntyre, William J.
 *McKay, Dennis A.
 *McKean, Scott H.
 *McKenna, Richard B.
 *McKenna, Russell E., Jr.
 *McKenney, Lynn D.
 *McLaughlin, Robert H.
 *McMann, Rupert W.
 *McManus, Richard W.
 *McMillan, John H.
 *McMullin, Lynn D.
 *McNair, Hines D.
 *McNerney, Daniel H.
 *McPherson, Richard S.
 *McQuown, Michael J.
 *McWhinney, John L.
 *Meakin, John D.
 *Mears, Edward I.
 *Medlin, William D.
 *Meek, Danny L.
 *Mehle, Roger W., Jr.
 *Meier, John H.
 *Meier, John O.
 *Mellmer, Darrell D.
 *Mercer, David S.
 *Meredith, Denis C.
 *Merkel, Alan N.
 *Merrick, Fred H.
 *Merrick, Russell B.
 *Metcalfe, Homer E.
 *Metcalfe, James A.
 *Metviner, Kenneth S.
 *Meyer, Thomas E.
 *Meyers, David W.
 *Meyett, Frederick E., Jr.
 *Mezmals, Andrejs M.
 *Miehle, Richard A.
 *Miles, Larry E.
 *Miles, Richard J.
 *Millen, Joel D.
 *Miller, Fredrick E.
 *Miller, George M., III
 *Miller, Joseph E.
 *Miller, Luke H., Jr.
 *Miller, Paul A.
 *Miller, Richard C.
 *Miller, Richard G.
 *Miller, Robert G.
 *Miller, Thomas H.
 *Miller, Warren C., Jr.
 *Milligan, Neil S.
 *Mills, John S., Jr.
 *Mills, Jon P.
 *Mills, Robert W.
 *Minter, Charles S., III
 *Mister, Richard W.
 *Mitchell, Albert H., Jr.
 *Mitchell, Daniel B.
 *Mitchell, James A.
 *Mitchell, Mitchell A.
 *Mitchell, Robert M.
 *Mitchell, Vance, J.
 *Mitchell, William H., Jr.
 *Mizner, Malvern M.
 *Moeker, George P.
 *Moffitt, William C.
 *Molczan, Eugene M.
 *Money, Jack L.
 *Monish, Aubrey R.
 *Monroe, Gene F.
 *Montana, Richard T.
 *Montgomery, George K.
 *Monticello, Donald A.
 *Moore, David B. A.
 *Moore, James P.
 *Moore, Jeffrey E.
 *Moore, Richard T., Jr.
 *Moore, Robert B., II
 *Moran, Daniel H., Jr.
 *Moran, William P., Jr.
 *Mordhorst, Rawson B.
 *Morgan, Donald H.
 *Morgan, John H., II
 *Morgan, Ronald R.
 *Morgan, William G.
 *Morgan, William L.
 *Moriarty, Richard W.
 *Morrill, Edgar M., Jr.
 *Morris, Donald R.
 *Morris, James H.
 *Morris, James E.
 *Morris, Max H.
 *Morse, Clayton K.
 *Mosdel, Donald B.
 *Moser, Curtis C.
 *Mosher, Wayne O.
 *Moskowitz, Donald A.
 *Mosler, Carl F.
 *Moss, Judd A.
 *Muehlenbrock, Dale R.
 *Mueller, James W.
 *Mueller, Kenneth R.
 *Muench, Paul W.
 *Mugar, Mark W.
 *Mulholland, Lyle J.
 *Muller, George J.
 *Mumford, Thomas F.
 *Muncy, Gerald W.
 *Mundell, Jack L.
 *Mundis, John A.
 *Mundy, Bruce T.
 *Mundy, Rodney O.
 *Munger, George E.
 *Murkland, Richard G.
 *Murphy, Robert P.
 *Murphy, William C.
 *Murray, Edwin A., Jr.
 *Murray, Robert L.
 *Murray, Troy Y.
 *Musick, George M., III
 *Mositano, Charles M.
 *Myers, James B. M.
 *Mysliwiec, Richard J.
 *Nadolski, Michael E.
 *Nargl, Anthony J.
 *Nash, Arthur R.
 *Nash, Malcolm P., III
 *Naumann, Walter H.
 *Navone, Peter F.
 *Neal, Jerome B.
 *Nearing, Lloyd
 *Nekrasz, Frank
 *Nelson, Carl, Jr.
 *Nelson, David A.
 *Nelson, Donald R.
 *Nelson, Floyd O.
 *Nelson, Harvey G.
 *Nelson, John W.
 *Nelson, Marion K.
 *Nelson, Norman K.
 *Nelson, Richard C.
 *Nelson, William B.
 *Nerangis, Nicholas J.
 *Nester, Cletis M.
 *Newcombe, Eddie Y.
 *Newkirk, Charles R.
 *Newkirk, Schirrell R.
 *Newland, James R.
 *Newman, Ray G.
 *Newman, Rex E.
 *Newsom, John H.
 *Newton, John L.
 *Newton, Joseph R.
 *Newton, Robert C.
 *Newton, Robert G.
 *Ng, George H.
 *Nicholas, Harry J.
 *Nichols, Donald F.
 *Nicholson, David C.
 *Nicholson, Eugene P., III
 *Nickerson, Robert G.
 *Niebuh, Walter W., II
 *Nightengale, Charles E.
 *Niss, Robert J.
 *Nobbs, Robert G.
 *Nolan, George F.
 *Norby, Richard W., Jr.
 *Norfleet, Richard N.
 *Norfolk, William C.
 *Norrell, Billy E.
 *Norrington, Gary A.
 *Norris, Dwayne O.
 *Northcraft, Zane W.
 *Norwood, Kenneth E.
 *Novak, Emanuel J.
 *Nowlin, Keith E.
 *Nuckols, James H.
 *Nundahl, Gerhard A.
 *Nuquist, Harold S., Jr.
 *Nutt, Forrest R.
 *Nutt, Richard L.
 *Oakwood, John P.
 *Oatway, William H., III
 *O'Brien, Fred E., Jr.
 *O'Brien, Michael C.
 *O'Brien, Terence J.
 *O'Brien, Thomas J., Jr.
 *Obsitnik, Michael P.
 *O'Claray, Daniel G.
 *Odel, Ernest G., Jr.
 *O'Donnell, Robert
 *O'Halloran, Patrick E., Jr.
 *Ohrenschall, Charles V.
 *O'Keefe, Cornelius F.
 *Okeson, Jerry K.
 *Okeson, Lars H.
 *Oleary, Charles P., Jr.
 *Oliver, David R., Jr.
 *Olson, Donald M.
 *Olson, Glenn C.
 *Olson, Kenneth P.
 *Omohundro, Richard E., Jr.
 *Opitz, William J.
 *Orgera, Winthrop B.
 *Orlando, James V., Jr.
 *Orourke, James E.
 *Orr, Charles R.
 *Ortwein, Richard M.
 *Osborne, Ronald D.
 *Osborne, Robert J.
 *Ostromecky, John R.
 *Otis, Robert B.
 *Ottinger, Gary B.
 *Otto, David A.
 *Overgard, William H.
 *Owen, Michael A.
 *Oyer, Edwin C.
 *Pace, James C.
 *Pace, Richard R.
 *Palen, Don G.
 *Palenscar, Alexander J., III
 *Palmer, Richard L.
 *Palmer, Ted L.
 *Papadakis, Myron P.
 *Papenbrook, Dewayne J.
 *Parker, Charles L.
 *Parker, Donald W.
 *Parker, Gerald T.
 *Parker, Michael R.
 *Parker, Raymond F.
 *Parker, Richard C.
 *Parker, William P.
 *Parkhurst, Nigel E.
 *Parks, John L.
 *Parmenter, Donald J.
 *Parotti, Phillip E.
 *Parsons, David W.
 *Parsons, Jeffrey M.
 *Parsons, Michael G.
 *Parten, Gary L.
 *Pass, Walter D.
 *Pate, Dwight W.
 *Patek, Joseph J.
 *Patterson, Carl G.
 *Patterson, Bernard L., III
 *Patterson, James K.
 *Pattison, Roger W.
 *Pauze, Philip C.
 *Pawlyk, William J.
 *Payne, John A.
 *Payne, John M.
 *Pearson, John W., Jr.
 *Peat, Charles T., III
 *Pefferkorn, Donald
 *Pell, Richard L.
 *Pekary, Raymond L.
 *Pendleton, John E.
 *Penn, William L.
 *Pennington, Chad A.
 *Peoples, Denton L.
 *Perkinson, Brian T.
 *Peroni, Peter R.
 *Perrle, Thomas D.
 *Perry, Harold E.
 *Perry, Jack R.
 *Perry, Wilburn R., Jr.
 *Pessoney, John T.
 *Peterman, Thomas R.
 *Peters, Victor L.
 *Peterson, Brent L.
 *Peterson, John C.
 *Pfeiffer, John J.
 *Phillips, Joseph E.
 *Phillips, Gerald D.
 *Phillips, George A., Jr.
 *Phillips, Paul E.
 *Phillips, Richard W.
 *Phillips, Richard J.
 *Fichotte, Leonard F.
 *Pietsch, Paul H.
 *Pike, William H., Jr.
 *Pilalas, Jason M.
 *Pilcher, Thomas E.
 *Pittenger, James A.
 *Plummer, Galen R.
 *Pogue, Jack K.
 *Polch, Robert
 *Polk, "R" "C"
 *Polk, Thomas A.
 *Polli, Joseph J.
 *Pons, Richard G.
 *Poole, Thurman H.
 *Pope, Carroll G.
 *Porter, John D.
 *Potrzebowski, Anthony C.
 *Potter, Douglas W.
 *Powers, John A., Jr.
 *Prather, Jerauld S.
 *Prather, William R., Jr.
 *Pratt, Richard R., Jr.
 *Price, William W., Jr.
 *Priebe, George C., Jr.
 *Proffitt, James R.
 *Prue, John E.
 *Pruitt, James G.
 *Puckett, David B.
 *Purcell, William O., Jr.
 *Purdy, Randolph S.
 *Pye, David B.
 *Quanbeck, Brian Richard
 *Quilllin, Philip D.
 *Quinton, Peter D.
 *Rabin, William D.
 *Radik, Frank M.
 *Ragano, James V.
 *Rahl, Roger L.
 *Rainey, Peter G.
 *Randall, Robert E.
 *Raulston, Donald R.
 *Rave, James A.
 *Rawls, James L.
 *Ray, Harold B.
 *Ray, Roy L., Jr.
 *Rayle, Lynn T., Jr.
 *Recknor, Robert B.
 *Redd, Benjamin D., Jr.
 *Redford, Thomas G., Jr.
 *Redington, Joseph J., III
 *Reed, John R.
 *Reed, John J.
 *Reemelin, Thomas E.
 *Rees, Bob G.
 *Reese, Dennis F.
 *Reese, Howard M.
 *Reeves, Donald L., Jr.
 *Regan, James P.
 *Reichmann, Michael I.
 *Reif, David C.
 *Relly, David L.
 *Reilly, Edward J., Jr.
 *Reinhardt, Kenneth G., Jr.
 *Reissig, Harold L.
 *Rejda, Dennis P.
 *Renfro, Mark A.
 *Retz, William A.
 *Reumann, Richard E.
 *Rex, Richard W.
 *Reynolds, David D.
 *Reynolds, Keith E.
 *Rich, Larry A.
 *Richards, Alvin J.
 *Richards, John J.
 *Richardson, Malcolm E.
 *Richardson, Frank H.
 *Richardson, Kennett T.
 *Richardson, David P.
 *Richter, Stephen W.
 *Rider, James R.
 *Ries, John G.
 *Riffe, Nathan L.
 *Rigby, George E., Jr.
 *Riggs, Norman J.
 *Riley, David R.
 *Ring, James E. P.
 *Ring, Roger E.
 *Risk, Ellwood T., Jr.
 *Ritchie, James R.
 *Ritchie, Joel M.
 *Ritter, Richard D.
 *Rixse, John H., III
 *Robbins, Charles B.

- Robbins, William A.
 *Roberts, Donley A.
 Roberts, Kim M.
 *Roberts, Thomas A.
 *Roberts, Walter S.
 *Roberts, William J., Jr.
 *Robertson, Thomas J.
 *Robidoux, Richard R.
 *Robinson, David B.
 Robinson, Gilbert F., Jr.
 *Robinson, Lee H., Jr.
 Robinson, William B., Jr.
 *Robison, James C.
 *Robson, James D.
 *Rochleau, Ronald D.
 Rodgers, James H.
 *Rodriguez, George T., Jr.
 *Roekner, Frank W.
 Rogers, David A.
 *Rogers, Donald T.
 *Rogers, John S., Jr.
 *Rogers, Richard B.
 *Rohm, Fredric W.
 *Rolf, Thomas H.
 *Rolloson, Peter L.
 Romo, Jesse C.
 *Rooney, Philip J.
 *Ropain, Donald A.
 *Rose, Francis I.
 Rosenbach, Richard W.
 *Rosendale, Eugene K.
 *Rosenthal, Stephen A.
 *Ross, Benjamin F., III
 *Ross, Raymond H., Jr.
 *Ross, Robert D.
 *Rossa, Thomas J.
 *Rote, James W.
 *Rotter, John W.
 Rounds, Bruce H.
 *Roundy, Paul V., III
 *Rouse, William G.
 Rouseau, Edward J.
 *Rowan, Donald J.
 *Roy, Rudolph J., Jr.
 Ruback, James T.
 *Ruck, Merrill W.
 *Ruckner, Edward A., Jr.
 *Rueff, James L., Jr.
 *Ruland, Walter B.
 *Rummele, John E.
 Rumsey, Charles G.
 *Runquist, Lars H.
 *Russell, Allan C.
 *Russell, Robert E.
 *Russell, William H., Jr.
 *Ryan, John E.
 *Ryan, Robert E.
 *Ryan, William M.
 *Saacke, Paul
 *Saber, Gerald W.
 *Sabo, William P., Jr.
 Sacks, George W.
 Sager, Harold E.
 *Saidman, Donald E.
 *Sallee, Oral N.
 *Salmon, Harry P., Jr.
 *Salquist, Roger H.
 *Salyards, Gregory M.
 *Samain, Jesse C.
 *Sammons, William C.
 *Sampsel, Michael M.
 *Sanborn, Richard E.
 *Sanders, James H., Jr.
 *Sanger, Kenneth T.
 *Santa, Charles R.
 *Sargent, Ian H.
 *Saul, Robert W., Jr.
 *Savage, Peter P.
 *Saville, Richard N.
 *Savod, Michael H.
 Sawyer, Ivan E.
 *Sawyer, Merrill C.
 Saxe, John F.
 *Scanlan, Paul T.
 Searce, George E.
 *Schaefer, Eric
 *Schafer, Carl E., II
 *Schall, Hugh E.
 *Schaller, Martin N.
 *Schantz, John M.
 *Schantz, Robert E.
 Schermerhorn, William M.
 *Scherrer, Robert J.
 *Schery, Ferdinand M.
 Scherz, Donald E.
 *Schirra, Francis R.
 *Schleifer, Paul
 Schloesser, Alcuin J.
 *Schmid, David M.
 *Schmidt, Charles M., Jr.
 *Schmidt, Donahue H.
 *Schmidt, Donald E.
 *Schmidt, Eugene E.
 *Schmidt, William C.
 *Schneck, Gary G.
 *Schnobelen, Albert V.
 *Scholand, Gerald W.
 *Schowalter, Ronald O.
 *Schroeder, Roger G.
 Schuerger, Richard F.
 *Schuffeldt, Coral V.
 *Schuff, George H.
 Schultz, Robert W., Jr.
 *Schuppert, Stephen M.
 *Schwab, James A.
 *Schwing, Emil M.
 *Scott, Crawford W.
 Scott, Earl C., Jr.
 Scott, Eugene W.
 Scott, Gerald W.
 *Scott, Jon P.
 *Scott, Lawrence A.
 Scott, William R.
 Scott, William J.
 *Scroggins, James J.
 *Scully, Michael A.
 Sealy, Bob D.
 *Seay, Austin M.
 *Seay, Clarence W., Jr.
 *Sebastian, Gary F.
 Secord, Ronald J.
 *Secrest, Glenn J.
 *Segal, Harold W.
 *Segrist, Edward L., Jr.
 *Selden, Thomas L.
 *Sell, Charles F.
 *Sellers, Alexander, III
 *Sellers, James K.
 Semeter, Leon, T., Jr.
 *Senappe, John, Jr.
 *Settle, Stuart W., Jr.
 *Sewell, Ralph B.
 *Shackleton, Norman J., Jr.
 Shaddock, Gilbert P.
 *Shafer, William D.
 *Shaffer, Lloyd E.
 *Shank, Lewis P.
 *Shanley, Richard J., Jr.
 Shannon, John R., Jr.
 *Shapard, James R., III
 *Sharp, Lawrence R.
 *Sharpe, Joseph D., Jr.
 *Shaw, James A., Jr.
 *Shaw, Robert D., Jr.
 *Sheehan, John W., Jr.
 Sheerer, George D.
 *Sheldon, Robert J.
 *Shelly, Michael H.
 *Shelton, Charles B., III
 *Shelton, James C., II
 *Shepard, James M.
 *Sheppard, Jay M.
 Sheppard, Owen H., Jr.
 *Sheridan, Daniel F.
 *Sheridan, Thomas R.
 *Sherman, Allan
 Sherman, Milton T.
 *Sherill, John A.
 Sherwood, Charles C.
 Shields, Robert J.
 Shinn, William C.
 Shires, Charles D.
 Shirk, Floyd D.
 *Shirley, Cloyce E.
 *Shirley, John W.
 Shultz, Kenneth D.
 *Shull, James M., Jr.
 *Shute, David C.
 *Shutt, Kenneth G.
 Sigg, Paul E.
 Sigler, William A.
 Signorelli, Ignatius A.
 Simkins, Kenneth R.
 *Simmonds, James L.
 *Simmons, Derek J.
 *Simmons, Robert E.
 *Simmons, Samuel F., Jr.
 Simoneaux, Eugene J.
 *Simpson, James K.
 *Simpson, Joseph J.
 *Simpson, Michael G.
 Simpson, Robert W.
 Sims, James H.
 *Sinasky, Robert H.
 *Sinclair, William E.
 *Sindorf, Thomas J.
 *Singer, James C.
 *Siskin, Edward J.
 *Skele, Martins
 *Slaughter, Jimmy R.
 *Slaughter, Dennis R.
 *Sloan, Robert E.
 *Small, Selden M.
 *Small, William E.
 *Smelley, Allan R.
 *Smiley, Stanley K.
 *Smith, Austin E.
 *Smith, Donald F.
 *Smith, Douglas G.
 *Smith, Ernest E.
 *Smith, Gary
 Smith, Gerald C.
 *Smith, Homer F., II
 Smith, John M.
 *Smith, Kenneth W.
 *Smith, Lary D.
 *Smith, Lewis C., Jr.
 *Smith, Marion J.
 Smith, Max E.
 Smith, Philip A.
 *Smith, Randall R.
 *Smith, Robert S.
 *Smith, Robert J.
 Smith, Wilburn C.
 Smith, William R.
 *Smith, Wilton J., Jr.
 *Smutko, John R., Jr.
 *Snyder, Frank W.
 *Sodergren, Brian
 *Solomon, Paul W.
 *Solon, James D.
 Soly, Edgar C., Jr.
 Souders, Robert L.
 *Soverel, Peter W.
 Sowers, Joseph A.
 *Sowersby, Roger L.
 *Spangler, John C.
 *Spear, Michael J.
 *Spell, David L.
 *Spence, Robert L.
 *Spencer, Gerald L.
 Spencer, Robert C.
 *Spradlin, Louis E.
 *Spruance, James H., III
 *Staehle, Charles M.
 Stage, Frederick R.
 *Stagman, James H., Jr.
 *Stahlkopf, Karl E.
 *Stakel, Robert W.
 *Stamper, Russell C.
 *Stanfield, Herbert M.
 Stanford, George H., Jr.
 Stanley, Jones H.
 *Starwich, Patrick C.
 *Staten, Howard S.
 *Stauffer, John J.
 Steber, Forrest E.
 *Steele, Billy R.
 *Steele, Robert L.
 *Steiner, William S.
 *Steinkruger, Frederick J.
 *Stender, Russell M.
 *Stephan, David G.
 *Stevens, Donald B.
 *Stevenson, Ronald B.
 *Stewart, James M.
 *Stewart, James H.
 *Stewart, William J.
 St. Germaine, Daron E.
 *Stiger, Robert D., Jr.
 *Stilwell, Samuel D.
 *Stinson, Jefferson D.
 *Stinson, Larry A.
 Stites, Jack T.
 *Stoddard, Howard S.
 Stoecker, Dale F.
 *Stonaker, Roland H., Jr.
 *Stone, Charles W., Jr.
 *Stone, John F.
 *Stone, Melvin F.
 *Stormer, John C., Jr.
 Story, Robert G.
 *Stout, Michael D.
 *Stowell, Ralph H., Jr.
 *Strasser, Joseph C.
 Strath, Robert H.
 *Street, Paul A.
 Streitt, Raymond S., Jr.
 *Striffler, Paul J.
 *Sturgeon, Robert W.
 Suarez, Ralph
 *Sudol, Walter E.
 Sullivan, Forrest M., Jr.
 *Sullivan, Joseph C.
 Sullivan, Jourdan T.
 Sullivan, James E.
 *Sullivan, Kevin F.
 *Sullivan, Leroy L.
 *Sumner, Thomas W.
 Sunderman, Robert J.
 *Surlis, Billy W.
 *Sutherland, Frederick H.
 *Sutphin, Sheldon D.
 *Sutton, Paul W.
 Swanson, Leo M.
 *Sweeney, Edward J., Jr.
 *Swenningson, Aaron P.
 Sylvestre, Raymond A.
 Steele, Jon Alfred
 Segen, John Pete
 *Tait, William F., Jr.
 *Tanis, Robert N.
 *Tanner, Eric R.
 *Tanner, Michael
 *Tanner, William A., Jr.
 *Tanski, William J.
 *Tartikoff, Peter A.
 *Tate, James A.
 *Tate, Robert W.
 *Tate, William A.
 *Taylor, Alan B.
 *Taylor, Bruce W.
 *Taylor, James E., Jr.
 Taylor, Kermit A.
 Taylor, Michael J.
 *Taylor, Robert C.
 *Taylor, Thomas L.
 *Taylor, Wade H., III
 *Tebben, Ronald D.
 *Telfer, Grant R.
 Tenney, Stuart L.
 *Testa, Ronald F.
 *Tetraut, Roger E.
 *Thiessen, Crispin W.
 *Thomas, David B.
 *Thomas, Donn E.
 *Thomas, Gary L.
 *Thomas, Gerald W.
 Thomas, Gordon E.
 *Thomas, Michael L.
 *Thomas, Norman M., III
 *Thomas, Patrick E.
 *Thomas, Raymond M.
 *Thomason, Harper J., II
 *Thompson, George F.
 Thompson, Gary R.
 *Thompson, Lalle H., Jr.
 Thompson, Lanty E.
 *Thompson, Olen D.
 *Thompson, Robert J.
 *Thompson, William H., II
 *Thorell, James C.
 *Thorn, John C.
 *Thornhill, David W.
 *Thornton, James C.
 *Thorson, Kenneth W.
 *Thorstenon, Lawrence A.
 *Thrasher, Craig L.
 *Thurman, Curtis F.
 *Tidball, Douglas D.
 Tighe, Glen E.
 *Tillapaugh, Martin J.
 *Tilley, Edmond A., Jr.
 Tillinghast, Theodore V.
 *Tillotson, Frank L.
 Timmons, Jack E.
 *Tineo, Dominick E.
 *Tobey, Robert M.
 *Tobin, Paul E., Jr.
 *Todd, James N.
 *Toensing, Ronald H.
 *Tolbert, Edward P.
 *Tolson, Arthur G.
 *Tomlin, Kit P.
 *Tomy, Wallace S.
 *Toth, Stephen S.
 Tower, Maurice E.
 *Towne, Donald E.
 Towne, Thomas N.
 *Trabandt, Charles A.
 *Tracy, George P.
 *Trani, Frederick E., Jr.
 *Traver, James E.
 *Truesdell, John M.
 *Tucker, Kenneth A.
 Tucker, Ronald D.
 *Tullis, Paul E., II
 *Turk, Edward J., Jr.
 Turley, Charles W.
 *Turner, Curtis W., Jr.
 *Turner, Eric A.
 *Turner, James R.
 Turpin, Dorsey L.
 Tuthill, James E.
 *Twardy, Clement R.
 *Uhr, John F.
 *Ullman, Harlan K.
 *Umphrey, Willard L.
 *Ungerma, Michael K.
 Ursprung, David L.
 *Valenta, Joseph R.
 Vambell, James P.
 *Vanarsdall, Clyde J., III
 *Vanburen, Robert L.
 *Vandervelde, Kent M.
 Vandiver, Clifford L.
 *Vanhofen, Scott A.
 *Vannice, Robert L., Jr.
 *Varelas, Constantine
 *Vaughan, George D.
 Vaughan, James B., Jr.
 *Vaughan, Raymond E.
 Veeck, Charles R., Jr.
 *Vetter, David A.
 *Vinson, Frederick D.
 *Vockel, William P.
 *Vollbrecht, Frederic
 *Vonderlinden, Arthur F.
 *Vonsydow, Vernon H.
 Voss, Robert A.
 *Vreeland, Peter G.
 *Waddoups, Lynn J.
 *Wagner, Glenn C.
 *Wagner, Karl B., Jr.
 *Wagner, William, Jr.
 *Waide, Kenneth B., Jr.
 *Wakefield, Richard G.
 Wales, Paul R.
 *Waline, Richard L.
 *Walker, Maurice C.
 *Wall, David H.
 *Wallace, Michael T.
 *Walsh, Edward L.
 *Walters, Ronald F.
 *Walther, Arthur E.
 *Walther, Ronald G.
 Waltman, Donald E.
 *Walton, Diggs O.
 *Walton, Don H.
 *Waples, Robert E.
 *Ward, Dan S.
 *Ward, Trenwith R.
 *Warmoth, Bobby G.
 *Warn, Jon C.
 *Warren, Ferrell D.
 *Warren, George C.
 *Warren, Roy D.
 Wasco, John F.
 *Waterfill, Joseph H., III
 Waters, David A.
 *Waters, Peter D.
 *Watkins, Jim R.
 *Watson, Forrest L.
 *Watson, Jeter M., III
 *Watson, Walter E.
 *Waugaman, Merle A.
 *Weale, Gary D.
 *Weaver, Charles T.
 *Weaving, Edward J., Jr.
 *Webb, Bruce C.
 *Webber, David A.
 *Webber, Robert T.
 *Webber, Thomas H., III
 *Webster, Richard A.
 *Weeks, Ernest E.
 *Weidman, Richard L.
 *Weidman, Robert H., Jr.
 *Weidner, Arthur H.
 *Weidt, Roland L.
 *Weihmiller, Gordon R.
 *Weisgerber, Donald E.
 Welch, Harry D.
 Wells, Bartholomew J., Jr.
 *Wells, David A.
 *Wellumson, Douglas R.
 Welsh, Walter L.
 *Welton, Donald E.
 Weniger, Marvin J.
 *Wennekamp, Marvin R.
 *Wermuth, John J., III
 *Werner, Robert M.
 *West, Caloway H.
 West, Richard L.
 *Westgard, Carl T.
 *Westhaus, William A.
 *Whalen, Frank R.

- *Whaley, Albert F., Jr.
 *Whaley, Ronald T.
 Whisler, Bruce A.
 *Whitaker, Johnny E.
 *White, Chester G., Jr.
 *White, Donald M., Jr.
 *White, Ernest D.
 *White, Larry R.
 *Whiteford, James D.
 *Whiting, Jay N.
 *Whitmore, Michael K.
 *Whitney, Payson R., Jr.
 Whitney, Vernon, E., Jr.
 *Whyte, George L.
 *Wicklund, Ralph D.
 *Widener, Harrell L.
 *Wiggins, William F.
 *Wilbanks, Joe D.
 *Wilcox, Keith L.
 *Wildman, Robert A.
 *Wiles, Ernest O.
 *Wilkins, Bernard H.
 *Wilkin, Howard A.
 *Wilkinson, Richard
 *Wilkinson, John G., Jr.
 Willan, Robert F.
 *Willand, Theodore A.
 *Williams, David W.
 Williams, Harold R.
 *Williams, John D.
 *Williams, James C.
 *Williams, Michael V.
 *Williams, Richard H.
 Williams, Ronald L.
 *Williams, Thomas J.
 Willis, Allan P., Jr.
 Willis, William A.
 *Wills, Ronald J.
 *Wilson, Albert S.
 Wilson, Charles E.
 Wilson, Edmund P. A.
 *Wilson, Gary W.
 *Wilson, George C.
 Wilson, George F.
 *Wilson, Ray G.
 *Wilson, Richard A.
 *Wilson, Robert M.
 *Wilson, Ronald K.
 *Wilson, Walter L.
 *Wilson, William H.
 *Winslow, Frederick D.
 *Winter, Stanley R.
 *Winters, Curtis J.
- *Wise, Walter C., Jr.
 *Wishart, Kenneth M.
 Wishart, Walter E.
 *Wisniewski, Walter F.
 *Wisniewski, Thomas C.
 *Witcraft, William R.
 *Witt, Charles R.
 *Witter, Raymond L.
 *Wold, Norman L.
 *Womble, Talmadge A.
 Wood, Carroll O.
 *Wood, David B.
 *Wood, Glen N.
 *Wood, Hansel T., Jr.
 *Woodman, Robert E.
 *Woodroof, Olen C., Jr.
 *Woods, Jerry R.
 *Woods, Paul F.
 *Woodward, Charles E.
 *Wools, Ronald J.
 *Worthylake, Donald H.
 Wrenn, Ralph E.
 Wright, James R.
 *Wright, Julian M., Jr.
 *Wright, Malcolm S.
 *Wright, Patrick E.
 *Wyatt, Charles E.
 Wyatt, Thomas W.
 *Wylie, William L.
 *Wyttenbach, Richard H.
 *Yarbrough, Milton E., Jr.
 *Yeend, George W., Jr.
 *Yentes, Richard D.
 Yeskelevitch, Joseph P.
 Yielding, Walter F. B.
 *Young, George S.
 *Young, George F.
 *Young, Kenneth E.
 *Young, Leonard G.
 *Young, Philip M.
 *Zagayko, Andrew R.
 *Zakis, Peter
 *Zanzot, Douglas H.
 Zarek, Lawrence J.
 *Zimmerman, Sherwood R.
 *Zlatoper, Ronald J.
 *Zielinski, Richard A.
- *Duran, John B.
 *Duvall, Russel W., II
 *Eadie, Paul W.
 Earliston, Robert P.
 *Erdahl, Eugene S.
 Evans, Neale W.
 Evasovich, John J.
 *Ezbianski, Joseph R.
 *Fischenich, Joseph R.
 *Fisher, Gary C.
 Flint, Ralph Q.
 Frame, Gene A.
 *Garabedian, Richard E.
 Giffin, Donald H.
 *Ginter, Howard A.
 Glennon, Edwin C.
 Goodhall, Ronald C.
 *Goodwin, Frederick E.
 *Grant, Robert D.
 Grantham, Armon G.
 *Green, David H.
 *Green, William T.
 *Grichel, Dietmar F.
 *Grover, Kenneth L.
 *Gushue, William, Jr.
 Hall, Robert G.
 *Halperin, Frederic I.
 Hamilton, James B.
 *Hammond, Robert H.
 *Hankins, William W.
 *Hansen, Neal C.
 Harper, Albert E.
 Harrison, Burnette S.
 *Harshbarger, Eugene B.
 *Hart, Charles A.
 Hatcher, Robert C.
 *Hawkins, Drake C.
 Hawkins, Joe C.
 Hawkins, Leonard R.
 Hawthorne, Richard L.
 *Healy, Theodore J.
 *Heenan, Donald F.
 *Hennessy, Daniel K.
 *Hering, Joseph F.
 *Hickman, Donald E.
 *Hildebrand, Jarold R.
 *Hinchman, James F.
 *Hines, Charles M.
 *Hobbs, Dennis W.
 Hobbs, Wilbur N.
 *Hopper, Frederick E.
 *Hubbard, Robert E.
 *Hundelt, George R.
 Hyman, William M.
 Jenkins, Donald L.
 *Jenson, Ronald L.
 Johnson, Jesse B.
 *Johnson, Joseph C.
 Johnson, Melvin M.
 *Johnston, David G., Jr.
 *Johnston, John M.
 *Joines, James R., Jr.
 Jones, Ronald C.
 *Jordahl, John C.
 *Jung, Dietger E.
 *Kanaley, Thomas M.
 *Kaufman, James D.
 Kazenas, Charles L.
 *Kenlin, Alfred W.
 *Kennedy, William L., Jr.
 *Kerr, Harold L., Jr.
 Key, James M.
 Kleckhefer, Edward H.
 Kilgore, Franklin D.
 *Kleinfeldt, Richard F.
 *Knesel, Barry M.
 *Koslovski, Michael
 Kowalski, Karl A., Jr.
 Krueger, Robert W.
 *Kunkle, Gary J.
 *Lafianza, Bernard J.
 *Larson, James R.
 *Lavery, John C.
 Lee, Charles R.
 *Leeper, James E., Jr.
 *Lehner, Paul M.
- *Lovejoy, John W.
 *Lovstedt, Joel M.
 *Lutz, Alan L.
 *Lutz, Harold, G., Jr.
 *MacCaulay, Charles P.
 *Magee, Joe A.
 *Manson, Walter B., III
 *Marien, Roger A.
 Mason, William C., Jr.
 Mauldin, Tommie S.
 *Maurer, Walter J.
 McCabe, Hugh R.
 *McCall, Charles R.
 *McClung, Hugh B. L.
 *McClure, John M.
 *McDermott, John E.
 *McGinnis, Thomas M., Jr.
 *McGraw, John R., III
 *McHaffie, Thomas G.
 *McIntyre, John F., Jr.
 *McMonagle, James M.
 *Meitzner, Robert O.
 Middlebrooks, Robert H.
 *Miller, Richard E.
 Minnis, Mel W.
 *Mitchell, John W.
 Monteith, Gary H.
 Morris, John G.
 Mortrud, David L.
 Mullen, James L.
 *Mundy, Gerald B.
 *Murphy, Charles G.
 *Naiva, William A.
 Nemmers, Robert S.
 *Newell, Robert R.
 *Newton, Kenneth R.
 *Nichols, Clifford J.
 Nimmo, James E.
 Nissen, Peter L., Jr.
 *Nomura, Gerald T.
 *Norris, David C.
 *Norton, Robert L.
 Norwood, Ernest D.
 *Nugent, George A.
 Ogletree, Daniel E.
 *O'Hara, Patrick J.
 O'Keefe, Charles A.
 O'Neal, Gerald L.
 Orness, Carl N.
 *Parrott, Ralph C.
 Patterson, Kenneth L., Sr.
 Peitler, Donald J.
 *Phillips, Bruce A.
 Phillips, Donald R.
 *Pinskey, Carl W.
 *Price, Robert F.
 Proffer, Teddy
 *Redfoot, Larry D.
 *Revere, Sidney P., Jr.
 Rich, Louis E.
 *Ricketts, Max V., Jr.
 Riedel, William M.
 *Roberts, William J.
 *Rosenfelt, William R.
 *Rubel, Michael J.
 *Rutherford, David O.
 *Ryan, Patrick G.
 *Ryan, Paul J.
 *Schamp, Roger G.
 *Schiel, William A.
 Schoppaul, Richard C.
 *Schuller, Christopher C.
 *Schultz, Robert A.
 *Schwerin, Robert R.
 Seroggs, Clifton R., Jr.
 *Severance, Robert A.
 *Sewell, John B.
 *Shay, Gary E.
 *Shefman, Ronald T.
 *Shields, Edward J.
 *Siburt, Forrest N., Jr.
 Silver, William W.
 *Singer, George M.
 *Smith, Richard M.
 *Sockwell, John E., III
- *Sollars, Thomas E.
 Spiller, James T.
 Spradlin, Willie L.
 *Stafford, Joe R.
 Stalker, Carlyle E.
 Stalvey, Joseph E.
 Stangl, Larry F.
 *Stewart, Michael R.
 *Stocker, Vernon D.
 *Stockslager, Earl M.
 *Stolark, Edward J.
 *Storz, Erwin F.
 *Straupenicks, Imants A.
 *Strickland, Robert M.
 *Strittmatter, Bernard D.
 *Strohmeier, Thomas E.
 *Sulek, Kenneth J.
 *Summers, John H.
 Swack, George R.
 *Swint, Joel K.
 *Tennant, Don L.
 *Terwilliger, Jackson R.
- *Tewelow, William H.
 Thompson, Ronald H.
 Tillman, Frank
 *Tonjum, James F.
 *Tracy, John J.
 *Travers, Donald E., II
 Troutman, Mark L.
 *Ullman, Robert C.
 *Unsicker, David W.
 *Vanpeit, David S.
 Vansickle, William J.
 Vantassel, Russel D.
 *Vick, Jerry W.
 Walkovik, Gary L.
 *Walton, Joseph L.
 *Wells, Paul D.
 *Whitmore, Thomas J.
 Whittemore, Walter J.
 *Wilkins, William T.
 Williams, James C.
 *Williford, David A.
 *Wong, Dennis W. H.
 *Yannessa, Thomas D.
 Zilm, Gerald D.
 Zitlau, Theodore
- CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS
 *Andrews, Richard E.
 *Bare, James C.
 *Battaille, Kenneth P.
 *Bedenbaugh, Garnett F.
 *Bernardo, Gerald S.
 Bonderman, Warner E.
 *Carder, Paul G.
 *Christiansen, David R.
 *Clancy, Eugene J.
 *Davis, Robert L.
 Drouin, Leon E., Jr.
 *Eckert, James W.
 Estes, George B.
 *Fadden, Dean E.
 Gallatin, William L.
 *Gammon, Kenneth D.
 *German, Arnold T.
 Goodspeed, James W.
 *Goodwin, Lawrence T.
 *Griffith, Harry G.
 *Hamer, Richard B.
 *Hanks, James E.
 Hatter, William H., Sr.
 Henley, John S.
 *Hosey, Gary R.
 *Hudspeth, Robert T.
 *Hull, David N.
 Jones, Ernest L.
- *Juliano, Peter G.
 *Kelley, Kenneth C.
 *Lynch, John F., III
 *McKee, Thomas C.
 *McKenna, John C.
 *Myers, Richard L.
 *Orfanedes, Evangelos C.
 *Pearson, Rufus J., III
 *Pero, Michael A., Jr.
 *Rankin, Terry V.
 Reilly, Eugene R.
 *Renzetti, Joseph L.
 *Robinson, James Y., Jr.
 *Rohrbach, Richard M.
 *Ross, David H.
 Ruff, John E.
 Sheaffer, Donald R.
 *Skrzypczak, Casimir S.
 Slater, Paul A.
 Smith, Ray A.
 *Snyder, Robert L.
 Stamm, John A.
 *Stewart, Stephen E.
 *Thimes, John F.
 *Vaudreuil, Wilfred J., Jr.
 *Warren, Ronald L.
 *Wheeler, Warren O.
 Whitmer, Richard D.
- MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS
 Ashmore, Robert J.
 Bain, Donald K.
 Bazzell, Samuel C.
 *Bell, "R" Thomas, III
 *Bond, James C.
 Briand, Frederick F.
 Cash, Harold D.
 Delisle, Gary R.
 Devault, Richard L.
 Eckmyre, Austin A., Jr.
 Johnson, Jerry L.
 Johnson, Larry W.
- Lane, Norman E.
 Ozmert, Bob L.
 Peck, Robert
 Postel, Kenneth L.
 Schweitzer, James D.
 Smith, James D.
 Snittjer, William J.
 Sonntag, Robert R., Jr.
 Thomas, Thomas E.
 Webb, Edgar P.
 Wilson, Jason A.
 Woods, Allen O.
- NURSE CORPS
 Coltharp, Dove A.
 *McKown, Frances C.
- Mary A. Gore, U.S. Navy, for permanent promotion to the grade of commander in the line, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.
- Lois E. Harden, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, for permanent promotion to the grade of commander in the Supply Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.
- The following named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line and
- SUPPLY CORPS
 *Actis, Charles L.
 Allen, Robert F.
 *Andrews, Ernest L., Jr.
 *Archer, Thomas C.
 *Arehart, Robert C.
 *Arendt, Richard D.
 *Barsness, James L.
 Bauman, Thomas W.
 *Bednar, Edmund J.
 Bell, Isaac W., Jr.
 *Bell, James J.
 Bence, Benjamin F.
 *Bergquist, John R.
 *Bettridge, Thomas M.
 *Bingemann, David A.
 *Black, Bill H.
 *Black, James T.
 *Blondin, Peter W.
 *Boone, Paul R.
 *Breeding, Earnie R.
 Britt, James W.
 *Brown, Gene S.
 *Bruno, Anthony
 Bugg, Norman D.
 *Bunch, Joseph R., Jr.
 *Burton, James C.
 Bush, Richard E.
 *Butler, David E.
 Caplan, David A.
 Carter, Gerald W.
- *Carter, William P., Jr.
 Carver, Franklin, Jr.
 *Casanova, Kenneth E.
 Casper, Harold R.
 *Chapman, George A., Jr.
 *Chisholm, Douglas L.
 *Cole, Chester B.
 *Collins, Michael E.
 Conner, Jimmy L.
 *Conner, John T.
 *Cook, Kendall R.
 Cooper, George T.
 *Coulter, Leland D.
 *Crooks, Roger E.
 *Cutter, David L.
 Daily, Jack M.
 *Davis, Fredric C.
 Deane, Thomas J., Jr.
 Dear, Jack M.
 *Defrancia, James M.
 *Demetriou, Eugene M., Jr.
 *Donahue, John R.
 Doran, William E.
 *Douglas, Bruce E.
 *Driskell, James D., III
 *Dunn, Robert G.

staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Burch, Mary J. Keating, Margaret L.
 *Buschmann, Virginia *McIlraith, Margaret
 Higgins, Maria S. A.
 Hollis, Zid V. Pierce, Velma A.
 Hunt, Owell V. Steenburgen, Anna L.

SUPPLY CORPS

*Carr, Mildred L.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Balink, Linda J. Jeske, Nancee G.
 Barrett, Barbara A. Kadenacy, Katherine
 Beagan, Rose B. M.
 Beckley, Mary A. Lakin, Alice I.
 Bingman, Bette K. Lotton, Geraldine
 Bonner, Jeanine A. Martin, Norene A.
 Bryniarski, Frances A. McCarthy, Margaret
 Clark, Georgia M.
 Clemmer, Patricia L. McKenzle, Ora A.
 Curry, Viola D. Meyer, Evva G.
 Daleo, Paula Motz, Ingrid M. I.
 Day, Grace Naughton, Mary D.
 Drury, Joy L. Nyce, Barbara R.
 Engle, Nancy J., Jr. Ratkoviak, Carolyn C.
 Francis, Sandra L. Rausch, Rosemary E.
 Gour, Jeanne M. Smalley, Phyllis E.
 Graichen, Dmitry L. Smith, Alice R.
 Hamilton, Susan F. Stolzenbach, Mary M.
 Hanlin, Ruth A. Terry, Agnes S.
 Harman, Elizabeth L. Uphus, Rosalind B.
 Hartshorn, Lena M. Volz, Martha R.
 Helmerl, Johanna F. Vorachek, Mary A.
 Hill, Linda M. Visbisky, Michal M.
 Honeycutt, Betty S. Watson, Kathryn A.
 Hower, Susan A. Wax, Norma J.

SUPPLY CORPS

Thiele, Jo A.

Harlan W. Armentrout, Civil Engineer Corps, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the line, limited duty only, in the temporary grade of lieutenant.

*James W. Fee, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the line, limited duty only, in the temporary grade of lieutenant (junior grade).

The following-named line officers of the U.S. Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and in the temporary grade of lieutenant:

Michael E. Nadolski Homer F. Smith, II
 Henry J. Schwartz Jerrold M. Smith
 Alan E. Smith

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and in the temporary grade of lieutenant:

Donald K. Franke Charles G. Rumsey
 Richardson L. Henley Robert H. Shaw, Jr.
 Guy B. Logan, Jr.

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

James W. Hargus
 Guy B. Logan

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of ensign:

Robert E. Biggerstaff Arnold W. J.
 James S. Coleman III McKechnie
 Duane S. Fulkles Douglas P. Metzger
 James W. Hargus Roger J. Smith
 Charles E. Humphrey Harry L. Turner II
 Jack E. Kohl, Jr. Gordon R. White, Jr.
 George A. Malinasky Robert U. Woodward
 Ralph R. McCumber, Jr.

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and in the temporary grade of lieutenant:

Reid Brodie III
 John H. T. Miles

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of ensign:

James R. Cain
 Roy H. Cook III
 William V. Smith

Robert L. Pou, Civil Engineer Corps, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the line in the permanent grade of ensign.

The following-named officers of the United States Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Amos, Robert E. Miller, Paul A.
 Baldwin, Carolyn O. Miller, Ralph R., III
 Balian, Alexander G. Mordhorst, Rawson B.
 Barker, Ross D. Morris, James H.
 Barthelme, Karl T., Muller, George J.
 Jr. Nash, Arthur R.
 Bell, Richard M. Newman, Ray G.
 Bennett, Denis F. Parker, Donald W.
 Benson, Richard E. Parker, John C., Jr.
 Berkebile, Jack Picotte, Leonard F.
 Brown, Paul F. Pittenger, James A.
 Burke, Michael E. Reichmann, Michael I.
 Ceckuth, Richard D. Reilly, David L.
 Connell, James E. Rejda, Dennis P.
 Deselms, Verl D. Riffle, Nathan L.
 Dixon, Ronald R. Roberts, Kim M.
 Drury, Joy L. Rumsey, Charles G.
 Dunn, Michael E. Schultz, Robert W., Jr.
 Elkins, Rodger N. Jr.
 Fitzmaurice, Cornelius Secrest, Glenn J.
 A., Jr. Shannon, John R., Jr.
 Fritz, Thomas C. Sheridan, Thomas C.
 Geppert, Robert C. Sites, Bruce L.
 Greeson, Tommy D. Smith, Larry D.
 Hanley, James J. Stanley, Jones H.
 Heffernan, Richard F. Steele, Jon A.
 Hood, John T. Suarez, Ralph
 Juengling, Robert G. Sutphin, Sheldon D.
 Kinderman, Lawrence Thomas, Norman M., III
 Kramer, James H. Weisgerber, Donald E.
 Kruse, Harry R. Wiggins, William F.
 Lawson, Joseph H., Jr. Wiles, Ernest O.
 Lord, William F. Wilson, Edmund P.
 Luksich, John W. Wilson, George G.
 McCollough, Ralph A. Woodroff, Olen C., Jr.
 McKenney, Lynn D. Wyatt, Thomas W.
 Mellmar, Darrell D.

SUPPLY CORPS

Allen, Robert F. Krueger, Robert W.
 Caplan, David A. McHaffie, Thomas G.
 Chapman, George A., Minnis, Mel W.
 Jr. Montheith, Gary H.
 Doran, William E. Morris, John G.
 Evasovich, John J. Mortrud, David L.
 Giffin, Donald H. Nemmers, Robert S.
 Hall, Robert G. Owens, Robert K.
 Hamilton, James B. Redfoot, Larry D.
 Harper, Albert E. Riedel, William M.
 Hatcher, Robert C. Scroggs, Clifton R., Jr.
 Hawthorne, Richard L. Stangl, Larry F.
 Hyman, William M. Tewelow, William H.
 Kleckhefer, Edward H. Thiele, Jo A.
 Koslovski, Michael VanTassel, Russel D.
 Kowalski, Karl A. Jr. Walkovik, Gary L.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Bonderman, Warner E. Estes, George B.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Ashmore, Robert J. Lane, Norman E.
 Devault, Richard L. Patterson, Patrick R.
 Giard, Emile N.

NURSE CORPS

Coltharp, Dove A.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grades indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Chief warrant officer, W-4

Abney, Walter R. Krehling, Leonard J.
 Acosta, Eugene J. Lacey, Louis P.
 Adams, Elton R., Jr. Laphan, Wesley E.
 Albee, Donald R. Lawrence, Harold K.
 Allard, Wesley J. Lee, Oliver E.
 Baglioni, Joseph J. Leonard, Robert L.
 Baker, Eugene V. Leone, Michael A.
 Barnett, Norman B. Lorenz, Lee
 Barnsdale, Everett K. Maccioli, Carmen
 Barrett, Norman R. Marit, Frank, Jr.
 Bates, Russell Martindale, Walter, Jr.
 Bauer, Robert N. Mastantuno, Joseph C.
 Beeby, Francis L. Mazgay, Joseph A.
 Begley, Eugene F. McCart, Paul G.
 Bell, Arthur R. McDonald, Billy B.
 Bennett, George A. McGuigan, John T.
 Bergman, Howard E. McGuire, Dewitt T.
 Bly, David McKinney, Rex U.
 Bodine, Allen D. McLeod, Junior D.
 Bonnette, George R. McNair, Douglas J.
 Boone, Raymond E. McNeil, Edsel
 Brehm, Carl L. Mello, Alfred
 Briggs, Lloyd C. Midgett, Sumner K., Jr.
 Brothers, Harold F. Minehan, Henry W.
 Brown, Glen R. Mittler, Jack E.
 Buch, Herbert W. Modic, Frank
 Buchanan, Oscar M. Molnar, William A.
 Burke, Mary L. Mooney, James L.
 Cagle, Otis H. Newton, Gordon B.
 Campbell, Walton B. Nolan, Donald N.
 Clement, Ralph J. Noll, Gus, Jr.
 Coan, Walter N., Jr. Norris, John H.
 Coates, James E. Nowlan, Robert B.
 Coleman, Arthur J. O'Donnell, Charles P.
 Collins, Paul N. Orr, Charles T.
 Conrardy, Robert H. Parsons, Thomas U.
 Corn, Frank E. Peltier, Robert M.
 Crawford, Newton U. Peringer, Allan C.
 Darouze, Manuel J. Perkins, David W.
 Davis, Claude R. Pinto, Joseph A.
 Davison, Richard F. Plaster, Coy T.
 Delaney, Thomas P. Putman, Alvin F.
 Derocher, Paul J. Queel, Craig J.
 Dool, Wilbur S., Jr. Rachford, Thoma J., Jr.
 Douglas, Daniel C. Rafalovich, Daniel S.
 Edwards, Richard M. Ramet, Charles C.
 Eldred, Fred H. Ramsey, Joseph D.
 Endrizzi, Emanuel J. Rangus, Anthony P.
 Erlandson, Helge W., Jr. Rauenzahn, Richard P.
 Fant, William F. Reed, Virgil L.
 Fraim, Cloris D., Jr. Rhoades, Donald M.
 Fuller, Ralph D. Richard, Louis H.
 Galling, Malcolm C. Richards, Lyle J.
 Gilbrook, Ralph W. Richcreek, Edmund V.
 Glass, Edward B. Rinehart, Forrest B.
 Goodman, Jack V. Robards, Stanley D.
 Gorman, Tom B., Jr. Robbins, Earl B.
 Grant, Paul H. Roberts, Leo B.
 Greene, Raymond J. Robinson, Eugene
 Greenlees, Roy W. Robinson, Lee R.
 Haines, Jesse M. Robinson, Steve H.
 Hale, Jack R. Roby, John P.
 Hamill, Joseph M. Sabota, Michael J.
 Hardison, Jeffrey J. SanFelippo, John J.
 Harrison, Fred, Jr. Sawin, Philip J.
 Helms, Harold L. Schuler, Russell L.
 Henking, Alfred M. Schweers, Nelson
 Hill, Keith B. Scott, Robert M.
 Hinson, Charles W. Shelton, Warren L.
 Hoffsetz, Robert F. Simko, Frank M.
 Huppee, Raymond M. Singer, Frank W.
 Huttig, William J. Smith, Coleman D., Jr.
 Ikard, Drennen G. Smith, Leland R.
 Ingleright, Vincent J. Smith, Luther W.
 James, James R. Snuffin, Royden O.
 Jamison, Eugene F. Southard, Conward B.
 Johnson, Wilbur C. Suggs, Cecil L. R.
 Johnston, Earl W. Sullivan, John L.
 Jordan, William C. Sweeney, George H.
 Kemp, Douglas R., Jr. Swenson, Wallace A.
 Kerekesh, Michael Tripodi, Benjamin L.
 King, Clinton R. Trotter, Edgar C.
 Klaas, Levene L.
 Kovacs, Michael

Unfried, Charles M.
Wallace, William H.
Warrick, Herbert B.
Watson, Roy D.
Welch, Claude W.
Westover, James R.

Chief warrant officer, W-3

Abbott, John C., Jr.
Agidius, Theodore H.
Allen, Fred A.
Anderson, James B.
Andries, Justin J., Jr.
Angulo, Mike M.
Ansley, William A.
Avery, Harrison W.
Barker, James D.
Barnhart, Marvin R.
Bartholomew, Cornelius R.
Bean, John M. P.
Bender, Marjorie G.
Bieber, Gustave W.
Bissen, Edward H.
Blackwell, Lewis
Blalock, Ralph T.
Boardman, William B.
Bowser, Albert E.
Brett, Robert A.
Brooks, James D.
Bruno, Anthony
Burkhart, Russell L.
Byars, Frank
Cannon, James G., Jr.
Casey, Henry F., Jr.
Collins, Richard S.
Conaway, Ralph H.
Cowell, Benjamin F.
Cranford, James F.
Cunniff, Thomas F.
Davis, Richard P.
Dorcy, Raymond M.
Drucker, Charles F., Jr.
Duran, John B.
Dyer, Otho E.
Eaton, Bernard E.
Eggers, Walter E.
Emmerson, Vernon D.
Endrizzi, Emanuel J.
Fagan, James F.
Faircloth, George B., Jr.
Fenstermaker, Roy E.
Furquerson, George W.
Garner, "J" "P"
Gillatt, Harold R.
Gray, James E.
Greenfield, William G.
Grudt, Dale
Haffey, John E.
Hagen, James E.
Hayter, Clifford C.
Heafner, James E.
Hensler, William
Hermesen, Gerald E.
Higgins, Dean S.
Hinckle, James P.
Holland, Andrew S.
Hollingsworth, William C.
Hollis, James D.
Inscow, Benjamin F.
Isselhardt, Francis X.
Jinnette, Richard H.
Johnson, Donald R.
Johnson, Edward H.
Johnson, Thomas M.
Jones, Daniel G.
Jones, Leonard F.
Kelsay, Alfred O.
Kelso, Don A.
Klimkewicz, Paul
Lacy, Gene H.

Chief warrant officer, W-2

Gilmore, Fredrick W.
Koehler, Merle H.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Wilgus, Edward E.
Wilson, Joseph H., Jr.
Winters, Raymond R.
Zachko, Peter G.
Zarr, Don W.

LaFave, Howard J.
LaFleur, Marshall J.
Laird, Harvey R.
Lash, Don L.
Lawrence, Thomas C.
Layne, Harry
Leamons, Forrest E.
Learned, Donald D.
Marbourg, Edgar F., Jr.
Marlitt, Charles R.
Mazzara, Philip C.
McCracken, James M.
McLeod, John B.
Merrick, William V.
Midgett, Sumner K., Jr.
Monaghan, Jerome A.
Morrissey, Peter C., Jr.
Murray, Richard
Nelson, Vernon J.
Nestor, Joseph L.
Nolan, Willis R.
Nolting, Fred W.
Olson, Alfred E.
Olson, Leon D.
Overly, Robert W. D.
Parkin, William V.
Parrish, Wiley B.
Patterson, William M.
Peragine, Joseph V.
Petersen, Hans P.
Petersen, Richard J.
Phillips, Richard W.
Proper, Gaylord L.
Ramsey, William T.
Rawlins, Billy J.
Reis, Adam W.
Reische, John V.
Robinet, Homer E.
Rodrigues, Leo L.
Roehs, Frederick J.
Rose, James M.
Rupert, Frederick R.
Sanchez, Ernest E.
Schimpf, William J.
Schmidt, Henry
Schrei, Robert C.
Seaton, Charles H.
Shafner, Paul
Shoop, Welland T.
Smallwood, Frank W., Jr.
Soule, William C.
Stagg, Philip R.
Steward, John L.
Stroberg, John E.
Swenson, Albert F., Jr.
Taylor, Robert M.
Tether, Charles E.
Thorpe, Leslie F.
Tyre, Clyde R.
VanCleef, Jacques E.
Vautier, Byron C.
Wagoner, James I., Jr.
Wheeler, Norman E.
Whiteside, James M.
Wildermuth, Aaron H. R.
Williams, George E.
Witkoski, Cheslaw
Woods, Kenneth W.
Worrell, Henry R.

Aabye, David C.
Abel, Bruce A.
Adams, Kenneth R., Jr.
Adamski, Frances B. A.
Adaschik, Anthony J.
Addison, Michael R.
Ahern, David G.
Aiken, William P.
Alexander, Marion R., Jr.
Alexander, Hugh M.
Alich, John A., Jr.
Allen, Henry D.
Allen, Noel M.
Anders, Robert L.
Andersen, Robert V.
Anderson, Cecil C.
Anderson, Daniel S.
Anderson, Dixon J.
Anderson, David C.
Anderson, Harold M.
Anderson, Jerold F.
Anderson, Russell F.
Anderson, Thomas P.
Andrews, John T., III
Angell, John P.
Apple, Lester A.
Applegate, Stephen S.
Apter, Marc T.
Archibald, Alfred W.
Armstrong, William L.
Arndt, Brian A.
Arnsward, Richard J.
Arny, Louis W., III
Arlington, Loren D.
Arrison, James M., III
Arterburn, James D.
Asher, Philip G., Jr.
Atkinson, Brian P.
Atkinson, Sid E.
Atwater, David C.
Atwell, Felton G.
Austin, Marshall H., Jr.
Ayers, James B.
Baack, Lawrence J.
Babb, Phillip R.
Bachinsky, Eric W.
Badger, Rodney R.
Baer, Thomas S.
Bailey, Jerry R.
Bain, Paul S.
Baird, Donald J.
Baker, William H.
Bakewell, Richard B.
Baldwin, George K.
Baldwin, Lewis S.
Ball, James H.
Ballard, Michael H.
Ballback, Leonard J., Jr.
Banks, Warren M.
Bankson, Rodney A.
Bard, Albert E.
Bard, Nicholas T., Jr.
Bare, George H.
Barker, Kenneth D.
Barksdale, William J.
Barnett, Thomas J.
Baron, Victor S.
Barsosky, John J.
Bartlett, Robert C.
Bauman, James R.
Baumrucker, Alan E.
Baumruk, Brian C.
Baumstark, James S.
Baxter, George G., III
Beall, James M., Jr.
Beam, Sherrill W.
Beardsley, John W.
Beaudry, Frederick H.
Bechell, Francis J., Jr.
Becker, Richard D.
Beckwith, Bruce B.
Beckwith, Ted Jr.
Becnel, Philip A., III
Bell, Lyndon R.
Bell, Robert S.
Bellafronto, Malcom J., Jr.

LINE

Bellucci, Gerald W.
Belser, Richard B., III
Benn, Walter J., Sr.
Benner, Francis J.
Bennett, Bobby E.
Bennett, Daniel C.
Bennitt, Brent M.
Benson, Harry J.
Benson, Lawrence P.
Benson, William T.
Bentz, Wilbur L.
Berdine, Robert A.
Berg, Peter W.
Berger, Henry G.
Berkowitz, Michael C.
Berman, Carl R., Jr.
Bernard, Lawrence G., Jr.
Bernstein, Stephen M.
Berry, Donald T.
Bertolotti, Ernest J.
Bevier, Robert L.
Biddle, James E.
Bienli, Daniel E.
Binder, Gregory D.
Bingham, John E.
Bintinger, David L.
Bishop, Robert W.
Biswanger, Charles T., III
Black, Francis M., Jr.
Black, George D., Jr.
Blackwelder, James M.
Blackwell, Bert E.
Blair, Jack R.
Blake, David A.
Blake, Ernest L., Jr.
Blakely, Donald R.
Bleye, George A., Jr.
Block, Martin J.
Boatman, Wayne A.
Boder, Robert H.
Boeck, Lothar S., Jr.
Boeddeker, Joseph C.
Boggs, Donald L.
Bolger, Robert K.
Bond, Robert L.
Bondi, Robert C.
Bonesteel, Craig G.
Borchers, Carl B.
Borman, Walter C., III
Borona, James S.
Bosken, Ronald J.
Bostic, Wayne H.
Bosworth, Robin
Bourdo, John D.
Bowden, Peter K.
Bowers, Richard C.
Bowman, Bruce R.
Bowman, Constance G.
Bowman, Gene M.
Boyce, Robert W.
Boyd, Joanne L.
Boydell, Bruce J.
Boydston, James L.
Boyer, Bruce A.
Boyer, Philip A., III
Brace, Richard A.
Bracker, William A.
Brady, Bruce M.
Brady, Robert J.
Brady, Timothy S.
Bragunier, William E.
Brandon, Harry B., III
Bransford, Robert A., Jr.
Brazil, Hugh E.
Breen, William J., III
Breninger, Alan F.
Bricker, Havel D.
Bricker, Jeffrey
Bright, Charles N.
Bright, Larry L.
Briner, Richard M.
Brittain, Ronald M.
Brookbank, Earl B., III
Brooks, Leon P., Jr.
Bross, Donald C.
Brown, Emory W., Jr.

Brown, James A.
Brown, Jeffrey L.
Brown, John F.
Brown, Lawrence O.
Browning, James W., II
Browning, John S., Jr.
Bryan, Herbert F.
Buchanan, John G.
Buckley, Russell H., Jr.
Buckley, William F.
Bugge, Marshall W.
Bullard, Winston P.
Burgess, Clifford T., Jr.
Burke, Richard L.
Burns, Michael F.
Burns, Richard J.
Burns, Roy D.
Burr, David S.
Burroughs, Gerald C.
Burton, Michael C.
Bushnell, Earle S.
Butler, Eugene L.
Butters, Alvin L., Jr.
Buttram, Robert H.
Byrne, Donn H.
Cable, David W.
Cable, Gordon G., Jr.
Cahill, Joseph F., Jr.
Caldwell, James D.
Caldwell, Max D.
Caler, John E.
Calhoun, Marcus B., Jr.
Callahan, Joseph W., Jr.
Callahan, Leonard P.
Callahan, Lawrence A.
Callahan, Michael W.
Cameron, "V" King
Cameron, William E., Jr.
Cameron, William T., Jr.
Camp, Norman T.
Campbell, James J.
Campbell, James R.
Campbell, John A., Jr.
Campbell, Malcolm L.
Cappalonga, Joseph H.
Caputo, Michael P.
Carey, David J.
Carey, James R.
Carey, Richard S.
Carle, Gary L.
Carlmark, Jon W.
Carlsen, "W" Eugene
Carlson, Eric
Carlson, James L.
Carmen, Marie M.
Carolan, James C.
Carroll, Charles E.
Carroll, Hugh E., II
Carroll, Thomas K., Jr.
Carson, William H., II
Carter, Lynn D.
Carter, Ronnie G.
Case, William F.
Cashman, Alan M.
Caskey, Maurice R.
Cassady, Robert T., Jr.
Cassell, Robin B.
Cassidy, Brian B.
Caudell, Willard G.
Cavaney, Byron M., Jr.
Cebrowski, Arthur K.
Cecil, Richard A.
Cepek, Robert J.
Chadwick, John E., Jr.
Chalfant, Donald K.
Chalkley, Henry G.
Chamberlain, Terry M.
Chambliss, Alfred P., III
Chancellor, Robert O.
Chandler, James F.
Chaney, William L., Jr.

Chappell, Joseph J., Jr.
Charlton, Anthony W.
Charron, Paul R.
Chastain, Max I.
Checkett, James J.
Chenault, David W., II
Chotvacs, Charles J.
Christal, Clark D.
Christensen, Daniel W.
Christensen, Ernest E., Jr.
Christian, Michael D.
Christian, George F.
Christie, Warren B., Jr.
Christie, William P.
Christina, Edward J.
Ciliberti, Richard V.
Cinco, Raymond Jr.
Clott, Paul A.
Claassen, Steven H.
Cladek, Edward A.
Clark, Henry H.
Clark, Hiram W., Jr.
Clark, James W.
Clark, Terrell I.
Clark, William H.
Clarke, Wilmot F.
Clary John C.
Claxton Keith E.
Clayborn William L.
Clemens, Kenneth E.
Clements, William G.
Clemmons, Victor E.
Cline, Michael L.
Clough, Geoffrey A.
Clow, Gordon H.
Cloward, Richard S.
Coburn, Clarence D., Jr.
Coffey, Edward C.
Collier, Arthur H.
Collins, Michael R.
Collins, Walter S.
Combe, Andrew J.
Combs, Michael C.
Common, John
Conant, Edward H.
Conlin, Michael
Connell, Daniel E.
Connolly Dennis J.
Content, Dale M.
Conterno, Paul A.
Cook, Cheryl S.
Cook, Douglas W.
Cooke, Lon M.
Cooper, John B., Jr.
Cooper, Roger M.
Copeland, Fred R., Jr.
Coppola, Ernest J.
Corgnati, Leino B., Jr.
Corwin, Thomas M.
Costello, John P., II
Costello, William B.
Coughlin, Michael D.
Coulon, Maurice W.
Coulson, Allan R.
Coward, Asbury, IV
Cox, John T.
Coyne, Martin C.
Cranston, Gregory V.
Crawford, Frederick R.
Crews, Thomas W., III
Croll, William H.
Cross, Robert C., Jr.
Cross, Ruth A.
Crosson, Edward M., Jr.
Crowley, Lionel L.
Croy, Paul A.
Culbertson, Charles F., Jr.
Cunniff, Betty L.
Curley, Richard C.
Currie, Louise B.
Curry, David W.
Curtis, Robert E.

- Cushing, John S.
Cusmano, Jerome H.
Custodi, George L.
Cutter, Douglas B.
Cutter, Mary A.
Czaplinski, Richard M.
Dalton, John H.
Daly, Daniel A.
Dambaugh, John A.
Dambrosio, Robert J.
Dameron, Michael
Daniel, Johnny H.
Danks, Alfred S.
Dantone, Joseph J., Jr.
Dargis, Kenneth R.
Darnell, Carlton H.
Dau, Frederick W., III
Davenport, Marvin E.
Davenport, Robert C.
David, Phillip H.
Davidson, Teddy G.
Davies, Samuel L., Jr.
Davies, William E., Jr.
Davis, Frank A.
Davis, George M.
Davis, Gerald, Jr.
Davis, James A.
Davis, James W., Jr.
Davis, Newell G.
Davis, Norman E.
Davis, Ralph R.
Davis, Thomas A.
Davis, Walter B.
Davis, William E.
Dawson, Richard W.
Dawson, Robert K.
Day Charles J.
Day, James R., Jr.
Debenport, David R.
Degreaf, Donald J.
Dehart, David A.
Detrick, Jack L.
Dekshenleiks, Vidvuds
Dell, Julius B., Jr.
Delorenzo, Robert A.
Demarco, Joseph G., Jr.
Demchik, Robert P.
Dempewolf, Philip W.
Dempsey, John E.
Dendy, Robert T.
Denslow, William R., Jr.
Depew, John F.
Deroco, Alan P.
Desantis, Frank C., Jr.
Desrochers, Joseph O.
Dettman, Bruce M.
Dettmer, John J.
Devilbiss, Jerome L.
Diener, William R.
Dillon, Brian D.
Dimuro, Jean A.
Dirren, Frank M., Jr.
Dobbins, William P., Jr.
Donalson, Robert C.
Donath, Robert M.
Donndelinger, Paul W.
Donnelly, John T., Jr.
Donohue, Bernard G., Jr.
Doubles, James E.
Douglass, Andrew I.
Dow, Paul R.
Doyle, James P.
Doyle, Michael W.
Dozier, James L., Jr.
Draper, Dennis G.
Drennan, Arthur P.
Drew, Raymond M.
Dreyer, Carl H.
Drinan, David R.
Driscoll, Thomas J.
Duffy, James M.
Dukes, Roland E.
Dunagan, Jerry M.
Dunlap, David B.
Dunn, Richard B.
Dunne, Gerald W.
Durden, John D.
Durepo, Charles F.
- Dwyer, David E.
Earle, John
Earnest, Richard L.
Easton, Robert W.
Eckstein, Eric R.
Eddy, Rodman M.
Edgar, George L.
Edge, Julian D.
Edmondson, Leslie S.
Edwards, Harry S., Jr.
Edwards, Henry B., Jr.
Edwards, John N.
Eggers, Jerome E.
Ehlers, Theodore J.
Eichler, George F.
Elberfeld, Lawrence G.
Elliot, Richard W.
Ellis, Braxton C.
Ellis, Donald G.
Ellis, Winford G.
Elsasser, Thomas C.
Emerson, David C.
Emerson, John M.
Engel, Leonard E., Jr.
Ennis, James D.
Epperly, Richard A.
Erman, Robert F., Jr.
Erickson, Clifford M.
Ericson, Walter A.
Erskine, Michael H.
Escobar, Frank A., Jr.
Eustis, David L.
Evangelidi, Cyril G.
Evans, Gerard R.
Evans, James J.
Evans, John M.
Evans, Larry A.
Evans, Marshall L.
Evans, Matthew S., Jr.
Everett, Jack W., Jr.
Eversole, Peter J.
Ewing, Robert L.
Ewing, William H., Jr.
Fabre, Frank J., Jr.
Faddis, Walter H.
Fagan, Richard T.
Fant, Glenn E., Jr.
Farmer, Claude S., Jr.
Farmer, Michael A.
Farmer, Michael J.
Farrar, David W.
Farrar, Dennis L.
Farrell, Edmund J., Jr.
Farrell, Robert J.
Fausz, James E.
Feeney, William F., Jr.
Fegan, Robert J., Jr.
Feltham, Francis M.
Fenton, Paul H.
Ferguson, James B., III
Fernald, James G.
Fernandez, Leabert R., Jr.
Ferrara, Michael A., Jr.
Ferraro, Robert V.
Ferris, Jeffrey E.
Feuerbacher, Dennis G.
Fey, William L., III
Finney, James H.
Fitts, Joel R.
Fitzgerald, John R., Jr.
Fitzgerald, John W.
Flentie, David L.
Flesher, Larry G.
Fletcher, Paul R.
Fletcher, Thomas R.
Flory, Thomas D.
Floth, Rowin K.
Foerster, Bruce S.
Foley, Michael J.
Foley, Richard W.
Fookes, Johanna F.
Forestell, William L.
Forman, Ernest H.
Forrester, George S.
Forsberg, Gary L.
Foster, James W.
- Foster, Thomas A.
Frame, Thomas A.
Franjevic, Barbara L.
Franks, William J., Jr.
Frazier, John H., III
Fredlund, Robert R., Jr.
Free, William E., III
French, Charles A.
Frenzel, Joseph W., Jr.
Frey, Raymond
Frick, Dennis D.
Fricke, Harold J., Jr.
Friedman, Marcus V.
Fromme, William R.
Frost, James M.
Fry, John L.
Fugard, William H.
Fuge, Douglas P.
Fulkerson, Grant D.
Fuller, James R.
Fulmer, Joseph A.
Fulwiler, James L.
Fusch, Kenneth E.
Gabala, James A.
Gaboric, George A.
Gadeken, Arlan D.
Galhier, Gaylord W.
Gallmeyer, Carl O.
Galvin, William J., Jr.
Gamrath, James C.
Gangloff, Wilmer C., Jr.
Gantzert, Gregory P.
Garber, John W., Jr.
Garrett, Carl E.
Garrett, Garland W.
Garrett, Mark E.
Gaston, Albert S., Jr.
Gates, Charles R.
Gault, Robert L.
Gaupin, Michael W.
Gawne, John C.
Gay, Marvin J.
Gaylord, William K.
Geddle, John M., Jr.
Gemmill, John W.
Genson, Gary L.
Georgenson, Ronald G.
Geraghty, John M.
Gerard, "W." Joseph
Germann, Larry F.
Gibson, Richard A.
Gides, George J.
Gier, Edwin F.
Gierman, Michael J.
Gildea, James J.
Giller, Gary D.
Gilles, Ronald J.
Gilmartin, John T.
Gilpin, Robert P.
Gilson, Frederick T., Jr.
Gingiss, Joel D.
Gist, David M.
Given, Robert O.
Glennon, Robert C.
Glevy, Daniel F.
Gnilka, Charles W.
Godinho, Antonio A.
Gogot, Jerome L.
Good, Gerald L.
Goolsby, Richard E.
Gordon, Barry A.
Gorman, John E.
Gosselin, Richard L.
Gottlieb, William A.
Grable, Joe F., Jr.
Graef, Peter J.
Graham, Clark
Graham, James J.
Graham, Richard D.
Graham, William H., III
Granere, Roger P.
Grant, John A.
Grant, Stephen I.
Grasser, Philip F.
Graves, John D.
Graves, Kenneth E.
- Gray, Douglas C.
Gray, Francis D.
Green, Daniel E.
Green, William F.
Greenberg, Peter D.
Greene, James B., Jr.
Greeson, Bernard D.
Gregg, Ronald I.
Gregg, William A., Jr.
Grier, George W., III
Griffin, Dominic B., III
Griffiths, Mark H.
Griggs, Carlton A.
Gross, Charles N.
Guess, Harry A.
Gustavson, Michael A.
Gutierrez, James E.
Haala, Patrick W. J.
Hahrmeyer, Howard W., Jr.
Hackett, Donald E., Jr.
Haines, William R.
Halbert, Richard W.
Hall, Fredrick S., Jr.
Hall, Gerald L.
Hallahan, Edward T., Jr.
Halpin, Francis J.
Hamilton, Gerald K.
Hammond, Thomas J.
Hampton, Mark I.
Hannsz, Donald A.
Hannum, Edmund P., Jr.
Hansel, Richard E.
Hansen, David G.
Hansen, Kathleen
Hanson, Dale E.
Hanson, Robert T., Jr.
Harder, Ronald E.
Hardy, Richard W.
Hare, Mary A.
Hargus, James W.
Harmon, Judd S.
Harrell, George E.
Harris, Arthur C., III
Harris, Richard C.
Harris, Stewart M.
Harris, Thomas H.
Harris, William R.
Harris, William I.
Harrison, Gilbert A.
Harrison, George C., Jr.
Harrison, Russell W., Jr.
Harter, Thomas R.
Hartman, Burr C.
Hartman, William M.
Harvey, James F.
Hassler, Bobby V.
Hastings, Steven C.
Haugen, James A.
Haupt, Katharine L.
Hauschildt, Walter F.
Hausmann, Gerald L.
Havican, Richard D.
Haw, Roger M.
Hawke, Thomas F.
Hawke, William W.
Hawkes, James B.
Hawley, John A., III
Haynes, Bobby J.
Hayward, James K.
Heath, Charles M., Jr.
Heeb, Benny J.
Heep, William A.
Heid, Billy L.
Heist, David W.
Hekel, Uils D.
Helyer, Gordon D.
Hemming, Jon S.
Henderson, Robert V., Jr.
Hendricks, Brian K.
Hendricks, James R.
Henning, Owen S.
Hennings, Louis W., III
Henry, Russell K.
Hepner, Bruce W.
- Hereford, Robert E., Jr.
Herriott, Robert P.
Hess, Gerald R.
Hewitt, George M.
Hewlett, Michael F.
Heyer, Robert W.
Heyse, Frederick H.
Hickey, Robert P.
Hiestand, Frank H.
Higgins, Charles T.
Hildebrandt, John L., III
Hill, David M.
Hill, Russell E.
Himbarger, Robert L.
Himmelspach, James E.
Hinkle, Robert M.
Hise, George E., II
Hiss, Roger A.
Hlavinka, Ronald R.
Hodge, Glenn M.
Hoeman, Richard D.
Hoferkamp, Allan, Sr.
Hoffman, Charles H.
Hoffman, Dennis R.
Hogan, Jerry F.
Hogarth, Thomas E.
Hollan, James E.
Hollett, Grant T., Jr.
Hollinger, Merlin B.
Hollis, Robert E.
Holloway, Lauris M.
Holman, Michael S.
Holmes, Gloria A.
Holmes, John M.
Holmes, John T.
Holmes, William C.
Holsenbeck, Daniel C.
Holton, John T.
Holton, Thomas R.
Holz, Arthur F.
Holzapfel, Alan K.
Hooper, Barry W.
Hopkins, Ralph W., Jr.
Hopkins, Robert D.
Horan, James J.
Horner, Jonathan N.
Horowitz, Albin
Horton, Douglas J.
Horton, Robert B., Jr.
Horton, William V.
Houghton, Jonathan P.
Houlder, Robert L.
Howard, James H., Jr.
Howard, Mark W.
Howell, Thomas E.
Howey, William D., Jr.
Howland, John G. B.
Howle, Kenneth M.
Howser, James H.
Hubbard, Howard H., III
Hubbard, James O.
Hufford, Philip T.
Hughes, Edward M.
Hughes, Robert O.
Hulick, Timothy P.
Hultin, Jerry M.
Humphrey, Bradford, Jr.
Humphreys, Wayne I.
Hunter, Gordon W.
Hurd, William J.
Hurst, Susan M.
Hutmaker, Matthew A., Jr.
Hutson, David D.
Hyde, Joseph G.
Hydrick, Harry W.
Hyland, William W., Jr.
Hynes, Robert F.
Iaconis, John F., Jr.
Igoe, Peter M.
Ince, Joe
Ingwersen, John L.
Irwin, Larry A.
Isaacs, Phillip W.
Isenberg, Michael T.
Jacobs, Philip R.
- Jamerson, Clifford L.
Jannik, John P.
Jardine, David A.
Jardis, Paul W.
Jarecki, Stephen A.
Jaroch, Timothy D.
Jarrett, Mark D.
Jennerjohn, Frederick A.
Jennings, James L.
Jennings, Paul R.
Jensen, Michael G.
Jenstad, Stephen E.
Jett, Charles C.
Joa, William R.
Johnson, Carmen J.
Johnson, Francis
Johnson, James F.
Johnson, Robert L.
Johnson, Stuart C.
Johnston, Thomas M.
Jolley, Ronald S.
Jones, Clark, R.
Jones, Donald W.
Jones, Gary P.
Jones, Kip E.
Jones, Philip K.
Jones, Robert D.
Jones, Roy W., II
Jones, Stephen H.
Jones, Thomas P.
Jones, Thomas H.
Jones, Wilton S.
Jontry, Michael J.
Jordan, James A.
Jordan, Robert L., Jr.
Jorgensen, William F.
Joyce, Robert H.
Juengling, Robert G.
Julian, Jerry L.
Julian, Robert K.
Jungels, Daneen L.
Jurgens, Henry J., Jr.
Kaeser, Karl H.
Kalal, Lindsey E.
Kaly, Richard A.
Kampf, Michael III
Kanning, David W.
Kaplan, Murray A.
Kastel, Bruce A.
Katahara, Ronald C.
Katz, Richard G.
Kearney, James M.
Kearns, Walter E.
Keating, Michael L.
Keefe, Paul H., Jr.
Keeney, Malcolm S.
Keim, Francis N.
Keithly, Roger M., Jr.
Kellen, Carl W.
Kelley, Thomas J.
Kellner, Gary E.
Kelly, Eugene E.
Kelly, George J., Jr.
Kelly, William C., Jr.
Kelsey, John P.
Kemmerer, Frank E.
Kemple, Morris M., Jr.
Kendall, John A.
Kennally, Thomas D.
Kennedy, James E.
Kenny, Michael D.
Kenslow, Michael J.
Keogh, Hugh D.
Kerr, Harry D.
Kessler, Walter W.
Kettelhardt, Henry R.
Key, William H., Jr.
Keyes, Joseph A., Jr.
Keyser, Richard L.
Kidder, Jason
Kiley, Dennis W.
Killam, Kent H.
Kimberling, Stephen M.
King, Edward F.
King, John D.
Kingsley, Wayne B.
Kipp, John L.
Kirk, Kerry E.
Kirkebo, John A.
Kirkland, Richard G.

- Kissinger, Jon W.
Klaas, Jack U.
Klamper, Rudolph J.
Klein, John F.
Klein, Karl M., Jr.
Kline, William G., III
Klocek, Kenneth D.
Kloppel, Byron P.
Knight, David M.
Knutson, Donald L.
Koenig, Austin V.
Koenig, Harold S.
Koerber, Keith G.
Kohla, Donald S.
Kolata, John D.
Kopel, Jerome M.
Koster, Edward H.
Kott, Roy A.
Kraft, Crispin S.
Kraft, James C.
Kraft, James N.
Kranz, David O.
Krekich, Alexander J.
Krell, Ronald M.
Kruke, Paul B.
Krum, Bruce G.
Laabs, Stephen K.
Labatte, Philip W., Jr.
Lacher, Richard G.
Lagreek, Paul W.
Lambert, John F.
Lamping, James R.
Lane, Thomas F.
Lang, Gerald T.
Lang, Michael A.
Langdon, John S., III
Lark, Robert H.
Larsen, Kenneth J.
Laskey, Charles E.
Latham, James M., Jr.
Latta, William A., Jr.
Laub, Eric W.
Lautenbacher, Conrad C., Jr.
Lautrup, Robert W.
Lavery, Daniel C.
Lawrence, Dennis A.
Lawrence, David W.
Lawrence, Robert E.
Lawson, Aaron R.
Lazarczyk, Gerald S.
Lea, Frank G.
Lebens, Francis T.
Lee, Allan R.
Lee, Richard D.
Lee, William T.
Lehman, William T.
Lehmann, Charles E.
Lemke, Anthony M.
Lenhard, Walter H., III
Leonard, George E., Jr.
Lepage, Armond C.
Lerich, Barry H.
Lester, David B.
Letart, Laurin H.
Lewczyk, Stanley C.
Lewis, Eben W., Jr.
Lewis, Elisabeth A.
Lewis, Leland G.
Lewis, Robert W.
Lherault, David J.
Lieblich, Donald H.
Liemandt, Michael J.
Lifsey, William H., Jr.
Lincoln, Lorelei M.
Lindsay, George H.
Lindsay, Ronald L.
Lins, Dorothy K.
Linton, Sidney E.
Lipscomb, David II
Litrenta, Peter L.
Little, Wade S.
Loarie, John A.
Loarie, Robert J.
Locke, Peter V.
Logan, Linda L.
Lohmann, Eric G.
Longeway, Kenneth L., Jr.
- Lopez, Thomas J.
Louise, Edward R., Jr.
Loucks, Steven J.
Lounsbury, Charles H., III
Lovig, Lawrence III
Lucas, Dale W.
Lucas, David N.
Lucas, George M.
Ludden, Richard W.
Ludlow, Ronald G.
Ludwig, Carl L.
Lunde, Roger K.
Lutton, Donald L.
Lutz, Robert E., Jr.
Luxford, Bruce
Lyford, George Jr.
Lyman, Melville H., III
Lynch, Richard H.
Lynch, Thomas C.
Lynch, William B.
Lyndon, Dennis C., Jr.
Lyon, Paul R.
Mable, Robert B.
Macaulay, William G.
MacBain, Thomas H., Jr.
MacDonald, Hugh H., II
MacDonald, Herbert M., III
MacFadyen, Bruce A.
MacIntyre, Norman L.
MacIntyre, Daniel I., IV
MacKaman, Bert J.
Mackin, Jere G.
Madigan, Paul J.
Magazine, Leonard A.
Maginn, James J.
Magnus, Royal S.
Magnuson, Bruce B.
Maguire, Bernard A., Jr.
Mahan, Richard J.
Mahoney, Clarence B., Jr.
Main, Ronald L.
Majer, Richard G.
Makowka, Andrew A.
Malahowski, Andrew A.
Malin, William T.
Mall, Phillip J.
Mallas, Paul A.
Maloney, Eugene D.
Manke, Joseph W.
Mann, Alcide S., Jr.
Mann, Charles E.
Mansell, William R.
Marciniak, Walter, Jr.
Markoff, Nicholas S.
Marsh, Charles L., Jr.
Marsh, Robert W.
Marshall, John S.
Martin, Daniel H., III
Martin, David A.
Martin, Michael M.
Martin, Ralph K.
Martin, Theodore J.
Mauney, Louie A.
Maurer, Christopher
Mayer, Joseph P., III
Mayfield, George A.
Maynard, John R.
Mayrose, William C.
McCarthy, James T.
McClain, Eileen
McClure, Robert G.
McClure, William E.
McConnell, James J.
McCoy, Charles K.
McCoy, Francis M., Jr.
McCutchin, Frank K., Jr.
McDaniel, Howard R.
McDermott, Richard A.
McDonald, Jay G.
McEachen, David T.
McFeely, Thomas E.
- McGee, Robert T.
McGhee, Barry L.
McGhee, William S.
McGill, John D.
McGraw, Michael L.
McGuire, Hagen B.
McGuire, Jeremiah J.
McKenney, Scott A.
McKinley, David H.
McLaughlin, Bruce R.
McLendon, Dana C.
McManus, Paul D.
McMullen, Dale A.
McMullen, John A.
McNamee, Stafford F., Jr.
McPherson, Dale L.
McWalters, James G.
Meals, Robert N., Jr.
McCleary, Reed B.
Medley, James R.
Medlock, John M., III
Meierdierks, John P.
Meiner, Grant S.
Melecosky, Timothy S.
Merritt, Richard J.
Merritts, Michael H.
Mesman, John F.
Messer, Andrew C.
Messmer, William L., Jr.
Metres, Philip J., Jr.
Metz, Paul A.
Meyer, James R.
Meyer, John F.
Meyers, Walter L.
Michele, Dennis A.
Michellini, Raymond T.
Mickelsen, Thomas M.
Middleton, Kenneth B., Jr.
Middleton, Phillip L.
Midgard, John D.
Milanette, Ro Terry
Milasich, Rudolph L., Jr.
Milhiser, Robert J.
Milloti, Louis D., Jr.
Miller, Don A., Jr.
Miller, John C.
Miller, John R.
Miller, Kent P.
Miller, Philip R.
Miller, Richard L.
Millis, Archibald E., Jr.
Mills, Bill L.
Miner, John O., Jr.
Minnich, Richard W., Jr.
Mitchell, George F.
Mitchell, Gordon L.
Mitchell, Michael G., Jr.
Mohns, Karl F.
Moir, Robert J.
Molloy, Francis H., Jr.
Moloney, Robert W., Jr.
Monaco, Edward A., Jr.
Mondul, Steven M.
Monroe, Philip R.
Monticello, John D.
Moore, Arl V., Jr.
Moore, Charles L., III
Moore, Kenneth J.
Moore, Lorie A.
Moore, Randall M.
Moore, Richard A.
Moored, Allen W.
Morgan, Harry E.
Morgan, Peter A.
Morris, David N.
Morris, Dennis A.
Morris, Henry T., III
Morris, Ricky K.
Morris, Willard W.
Morrow, Emil D.
Morse, John H., III
Moscrip, William M.
- Moseley, Donald L.
Moser, Alan B.
Moser, Ronald J.
Moulton, Daniel
Moyer, Benjamin M., Jr.
Mulholland, James W.
Mullen, Carl M.
Mulligan, John B., Jr.
Mumaw, John J.
Mundhenke, David J.
Munro, Alexander F., II
Murphy, Andrew J.
Murphy, Charles R., Jr.
Murphy, Francis J., Jr.
Murphy, George J.
Murphy, Richard L.
Murphy, William H., III
Murray, Terry D.
Murray, Thomas O.
Muti, Richard S.
Myers, Larry R.
Myers, Richard T.
Myron, Terry J.
Myshka, Robert J.
Nagel, Jon W.
Najarian, Moses T.
Natter, William H., Jr.
Nave, Michael A.
Navoy, Joseph F.
Nazarenus, Dorothy M.
Neal, Joseph F. H.
Neff, Evan A., Jr.
Negin, Jerrold J.
Nelson, Arthur W., III
Nelson, Richard J. L.
Nelson, Richard G.
Neubauer, David C.
Newby, Lewis R.
Newell, Robert B., Jr.
Newell, Thomas L.
Newkirk, Robert A.
Newman, Robert E.
Nicarico, Thomas J.
Nicolai, Marino J.
Nichols, Aubrey A.
Nichols, Douglas R.
Nichols, Larry A.
Nicholson, Edwin P.
Nickelsburg, Michael
Nicklo, John E., Jr.
Nielsen, Leonard M.
Nissley, Donald W.
Nivert, Frank J.
Noah, Robert M.
Norton, James L.
Norvell, James D.
Novak, Stuart M.
Novick, Harold L.
Novitzki, James E.
Nowlin, Herbert D., Jr.
Nuernberger, John A.
Nunn, James W.
O'Connell, Anthony M.
O'Connor, Paul P.
O'Connor, Richard D.
O'Connor, William V.
Oehlenschlaeger, John G.
Oglesby, Douglas A.
Okasinski, Theodore T.
Oldendorph, Wayne E.
O'Leary, Arthur J.
Olechna, Walter M.
Oliver, Michael F.
Olsen, Lynette M.
Olsen, Murray F.
Olson, Harold M., Jr.
O'Neill, Charles P., Jr.
O'Neill, Paul T.
Onestinghel, John L.
Oppenheimer, Lawrence H.
Orlosky, Robert A.
Orsburn, John D.
- Osgood, Frederick J.
Osten, Judd F.
Ostertag, James J.
Ounsworth, James A.
Overman, Lawrence D.
Owen, James E.
Owen, Richard E.
Oxboel, Eric H.
Oxenrider, Eugene L.
Paddock, Gary V.
Paduano, Harry N., Jr.
Page, Bruce D.
Page, Charles W.
Palatucci, Armand T.
Palmgren, George F.
Palombi, John H.
Pandolfi, Peter M.
Pannunzio, Thomas W.
Parish, Charles C.
Parker, Brance J.
Parker, Michael W.
Parkinson, Keith L.
Paron, John R.
Parrott, Arthur G., Jr.
Parry, David J.
Parry, Thomas L., Jr.
Pasahow, Edward J.
Pasch, James R.
Paschyn, Bohdan Y.
Pastorius, James G., Jr.
Patience, Wesley F., Jr.
Patterson, Robert E.
Patterson, John W.
Payne, Charles S.
Payson, Charles B.
Payton, James E.
Peake, William W. F.
Pearson, Nils A. S.
Pelzer, Carl A.
Pemberton, "L" Michael
Pennington, Arthur J.
Perine, Philip C.
Perkins, Henry G., Jr.
Perkins, James B., III
Pernini, James K.
Perron, Robert A.
Perrone, Paul E.
Perry, Fred G.
Peterson, Douglas D.
Peterson, Eric L.
Peterson, Richard S.
Peterson, Winston H.
Pettigrew, Kenneth W.
Pewett, Robert H.
Phaler, Karl J.
Phelan, Elizabeth A.
Phelan, Richard H.
Phillips, Alexander M.
Pietrzykowski, Richard Rogers, Beverly J. E.
Pignotti, Dennis A.
Picher, Imon L.
Pirnie, Morgan S.
Planchon, Harry P., Jr.
Plott, Barry M.
Plumb, Joseph C., Jr.
Plunkett, Michael F.
Polhemus, Frank N.
Pollock, Walter E., III
Poole, James L.
Poole, William J.
Porterfield, James H., Jr.
Powell, Eleanor L.
Powell, Robert R.
Powers, Robert L.
Pozzi, Craig D.
Prath, Robert L. E.
Press, Jay L.
Press, Nicholas L.
Prewitt, Dennis L.
Price, Ira T.
- Price, Joseph M.
Price, Rudolph P.
Price, Thomas L.
Priest, Edgar D., Jr.
Probst, Lawrence E.
Prouty, William H.
Prueher, Joseph W.
Pugh, Thomas O.
Pulk, Allen F.
Putnam, Alan G.
Quaintance, Michael J.
Quale, Gareth D.
Quirk, William F., Jr.
Radder, Norman C.
Radtko, Norman D.
Raffo, Thomas G.
Ralston, Allie J.
Ramsey, William J.
Ramskill, Clayton R.
Ranes, Richard C.
Ransom, Marilu E.
Ratcliff, Floyd W., Jr.
Ratcliff, James R.
Ratzlaff, Richard R.
Ray, Dennis E.
Ray, Donald J.
Ray, Norman W.
Read David W.
Reardon, Patrick J.
Reberger, John P.
Reckner, James R.
Reddoch, Russell
Reid, Walter J., Jr.
Reineke, Robert A.
Reite, Charles D.
Reitmeyer, David J.
Relinger, Barry R.
Reller, Robert H.
Renshaw, George S.
Restivo, Joseph L.
Ribka, John P.
Ricci, Enrico A.
Richards, Stephen D.
Richardson, John W.
Richey, Robert B.
Richman, Thomas N.
Riggs, Charles A.
Riley, John R.
Riley, Robert H.
Rinker, Robert E.
Riordan, Robert F.
Risseuw, Hugh J.
Ritchey, Glenn W., Jr.
Robbins, Richard J.
Roberts, James L.
Roberts, John E.
Roberts, Robert E.
Roberts, William R., Jr.
Robertson, Charles L.
Robertson, John E. IV
Robertson, Neil A.
Robertson, Robert E., III
Robinson, Louis N.
Rode, Matthew G.
Rodrick, Peter T.
Rogers, Beverly J.
Rollins, Richard A.
Romney, Richard B.
Roth, David R.
Rowe, Paul E., Jr.
Roy, Richard P.
Rozer, Marvin J.
Ruble, Richard S., Jr.
Rudy, Joseph J., Jr.
Rugowski, James S.
Ruhe, William J., Jr.
Rumely, Peter K.
Russell, Charles E.
Russell, Jay B.
Russell, Lawrence M.
Russell, Mary E.
Ryan, Bruce A.
Rypka, Allan E.
Sadamoto, Theodore K.
Sadler, Clint D.
Safford, Sylvia A.
Sal, John J.
Salerno, Henry D.

- Salzer, Frederick D.
Sambrook, Susan L.
Samford, Jack W.
Sande, John D.
Sanders, James E., III
Sanders, Ronald J.
Sanger, John P.
Sarafian, Peter G.
Sargent, William P.
Sartoris, Joel R.
Satrapa, Joseph F.
Saucier, Edward T.
Saul, Joe M.
Saulnier, Steven C.
Savage, Charles J.
Sawer, Kermit L.
Sawert, Ulf
Sawicki, Halary S.
Schempp, Dale A.
Schermerhorn, Richard Van R.
Schilling, Robert A.
Schlechte, Roger E.
Schlichter, Ralph
Schmauss, Henry W., Jr.
Schmidt, Baldwin S.
Schmidt, Clifford B.
Schmidt, Kenneth A.
Schmidt, Richard H.
Schmitt, Carl H.
Schmitt, Stuart O.
Schnabel, Randolph E.
Schneeberger, Carl E.
Schneider, David R.
Schneider, Michael J., Jr.
Schoeff, David D.
Schoenberger, Edwin E.
Schomann, Charles F., III
Schroeder, Robert F.
Schueman, Gerald M.
Schultz, Henry F.
Schwarz, William F.
Schweers, Robert J., Jr.
Schwemm, Henry C., Jr.
Schwertman, Neil C.
Scigulinsky, Kenneth F.
Scott, David T.
Scott, Kenneth E.
Scott, Ronald B.
Scott, Velma J.
Scoville, Edward N., II
Seeley, James R.
Seffel, Joel S.
Sell, Harry D.
Selzer, Bryan E.
Senecal, Robert P., II
Sewall, Murphy A.
Sewell, Richard A.
Seyk, Donald E.
Seyl, Stephen J.
Shanahan, James F.
Shannon, William A., I
Sharp, Jerry L.
Sharplin, Arthur D.
Shaughnessy, William F., III
Shea, Joseph M., Jr.
Sheehan, William L., Jr.
Sheffer, George T.
Sherman, Philip K., Jr.
Sherman, Robert E.
Shields, Andrew M.
Shields, Charles D., Jr.
Shiffer, William T. Jr.
Shigetani, Ronald Y.
Shindler, Glenn E.
Shoemaker, Charles L.
Shriver, Ronald E.
Shultz, John R.
Shumway, Geoffrey R.
Shunk, Robert S.
- Siddens, William M.
Siebert, Herro H.
Sieren, Gerald J.
Sigrist, Robert L., Jr.
Silver, Lawrence M.
Silvert, Robert M., Jr.
Simpson, Thomas E.
Sims, William B., Jr.
Sipe, Edman L.
Sirmans, Russell E.
Sisson, Harold D., Jr.
Sitten, Luther F.
Sjoggerud, David M.
Skidmore, Wiley H.
Slaughter, William J.
Sloan, William T., Jr.
Slough, Phillip R.
Slover, William A.
Small, Stephen B.
Smallwood, Frederick K.
Smith, Alan B.
Smith, Dean K.
Smith, Donald V.
Smith, Duane R.
Smith, Ernest M.
Smith, Gordon L.
Smith, Jessie M.
Smith, John W.
Smith, Johnny F.
Smith, Ralph F.
Smith, Robert I.
Smith, Stephen W.
Smith, Terry L.
Smith, William S., Jr.
Smith, William T., III
Smittle, John H.
Smolen, Theodore F.
Snell, Gerald C.
Snyder, Keith R.
Snyder, Stanley J., Jr.
Sorensen, James C.
Sowa, Walter, Jr.
Spangenberg, Frank A., III
Spence, Charles H., Jr.
Spencer, James L., III
Spencer, Roger B.
Spilseth, George M.
Spina, David A.
Spradlin, Dennis R.
Spriggs, William E.
Sprawls, George F.
Spruitenburg, Fredrik H. M.
Stacy, Terry A.
Stahl, William L., Jr.
Stair, Sammy D.
Staley, Joseph J., Jr.
Staley, Kevin T.
Stamps, David W.
Stanbery, Sam R., Jr.
Stanford, Paul M.
Stark, Richard N.
Starkey, Russell B., Jr.
Starks, William L.
Starnes, Phillip V.
Starritt, Douglas R.
Stebbins, John M.
Stephens, Robert S.
Sternberg, Daniel M.
Stern, David L.
Steudel, Edward M., Jr.
Stevens, Robert P.
Stewart, Robert P.
Stick, Thomas H.
Stineman, Joseph N.
Stolz, Robert S.
Stone, Raymond E., Jr.
Stoughton, Robert A.
Streeter, Richard J.
Stringer, Terrance L.
Strong, Barton D.
Struck, Allan P.
Suckow, John R.
Sullivan, Dennis M.
Sullivan, David J.
- Sullivan, James J.
Sullivan, Thomas B.
Summers, Daryl D.
Sutton, Robert
Swainbank, John A., Jr.
Swan, James N.
Swanson, Herbert F., Jr.
Swartz, Thomas J.
Sweeney, Roger D.
Sweet, John C. S.
Swift, Roger B.
Swindle, Kelly F., Jr.
Swinford, Daniel N.
Switzer, Wayne J.
Swyers, Harry M.
Tabel, Dennis A.
Tackney, Michael O.
Taday, Alexander A.
Talbot, John H., Jr.
Talley, William W. II
Tasin, Terry J.
Taylor, Anthony R.
Taylor, Clark M.
Taylor, Donald O.
Taylor, John M. IV
Taylor, Keith A.
Taylor, Robert B. III
Taynton, Lewis F.
Tedder, James T., Jr.
Tenanty, Joseph R., Jr.
Tenbrook, John H.
Terhune, Robert J.
Thelen, Frank III
Thiel, Douglas J.
Thies, Terry N.
Thomas, Bruce A.
Thomas, Benjamin F.
Thomas, Glenn E.
Thomas, James R., Jr.
Thomasson, Albert F.
Thompson, Bryce A.
Thompson, David D.
Thompson, Donnie H.
Thompson, James A.
Thompson, Roy W.
Thunette, John F.
Tinston, William J., Jr.
Tipper, Ronald C.
Tipton, Michael S.
Tisaranai, James
Tittle, Harold E.
Tobey, Gary H.
Toczek, Thomas R.
Todd, John H.
Tolbert, James K.
Tollefson, Gordon V.
Tollison, Alfred C., Jr.
Tomashek, Charles J.
Toporoski, Daniel M., Jr.
Toporoski, Martha L.
Tornberg, David N.
Tortorice, Donald A.
Trace, David A.
Tracy, Robert N., Jr.
Treadwell, David M.
Trease, Charles J., Jr.
Treiber, Gale E.
Trembley, "J" Forest G.
Triebl, Theodore W.
Trumpler, Richard P.
Tudor, Richard A.
Tull, Richard P.
Tuma, David F.
Tune, James F.
Turk, Mark L.
Turner, James E., Jr.
Turner, Laurence H., Jr.
Turner, Margie L.
Turner, Thomas W.
Tweel, John A.
Twomey, Daniel T.
Twyford, Lee V., Jr.
Ulrich, William S.
Unfrid, Richard P., III
Unrau, Jerry L.
- Vacin, Edward M.
Vadopoulos, Anthony S.
Vail, David W.
Vail, Timothy L.
Vallance, Winfred D.
Vanasek, John M.
Vanduzer, Roger E.
Vanliere, James I.
Vanlue, Kenton W.
Vanwinkle, Pieter K.
Vaupel, George B.
Vernon, Larry J.
Verry, Rita L.
Viafore, Kenneth M.
Vickers, Russell T.
Vickery, Wayne M.
Vitek, Randall W.
Vogeler, Karl A., III
Volk, Charles L., Jr.
Vollertsen, Edward P., III
Vollmer, Ernst P.
Vorwerk, John A.
Vosilus, Robert B.
Waeltz, John A.
Wagner, David A.
Waldron, William C., III
Waldrop, Keith A.
Wales, Frederick P.
Walkenford, John H., III
Walker, Michael G.
Walker, Paul L.
Walker, Robert F.
Walsh, David H.
Walter, Leonard D.
Walton, Margurite A.
Wangaard, Frederick F., Jr.
Ward, Gail M.
Ward, Robert F.
Ward, Terry W.
Wasleski, George T., Jr.
Wass, Leonard R.
Watkins, John R.
Watson, Mitchell L.
Weal, Keith I.
Weaver, Ben A.
Weber, Gerald W.
Weber, Harry C.
Weed, Wilson G.
Weerts, Gary L.
Weigel, Albert R.
Weigel, William R., Jr.
Weir, Robert F.
Wellmann, Donald A.
Wells, Bruce
Welsh, Richard G. T.
Welsh, Robert M.
Welty, Charles S., Jr.
Wemple, Christopher Y.
Werner, Keith M.
Wesley, David R.
West, John C., Jr.
Westberg, Eric L.
Weston, Mark H.
Wexler, Clifford W., Jr.
Whitehead, Albert E.
Whittle, Gerard T.
Wiel, Thomas T.
Wilbourne, David G.
Wilf, Jeffrey
Wilkins, Adrian R.
Wilkins, Joe L.
Wilkinson, Harry R.
Wilkinson, John P., III
Williams, Billy B.
Williams, David I.
Williams, Donald E.
Williams, John E.
Williams, Keener T.
Williams, Paul R.
Williams, Richard D., III
Williams, Thatason L. J.
Willis, Thomas A.
Wilson, Jack W.
- Wilson, Jeffrey V.
Wilson, Melvin A.
Wilson, Richard M.
Wilson, William E.
Winant, Frank G.
Windle, Frederick J., Jr.
Winn, James R.
Winquist, John C.
Winsley, Mary B.
Wisnburg, Mark R.
Witter, Ray C.
Woll, Paul F.
Wong, Henry K.
Wood, Bruce K.
Wood, Neil F.
Woodard, Arch
Woodard, Sanford G.
Woodruff, Robert B.
Woolett, Jerry F.
Wornson, Richard F.
Wright, Charles W.
Wright, David R.
Wright, Donald J.
Wright, Douglas F.
- Wright, Hubert H., IV
Wright, John R.
Wright, John T.
Wright, Robert E.
Wright, Webster M., Jr.
Wright, William H., IV
Wynne, David C.
Yarborough, Bruce N.
Yarborough, Hugh W.
Yates, Serena E.
Young, Brian A.
Young, Gary A.
Young, Gerry A.
Young, Joe E.
Yule, Robert B.
Zabritski, James J.
Zakarian, Jacob H.
Zech, Gary G.
Zeller, Ronald L.
Zimmer, Robert J.
Zimmerman, Fredric C.
Zimmerman, Gary A.
Zohlen, John T.
Zwirschtz, Gary W.

SUPPLY CORPS

- Armstrong, George R.
Ballbach, John D.
Barton, Gary M.
Bary, David S.
Bates, Richard A.
Bell, James W.
Bezanilla, David G.
Bice, Fred, Jr.
Bill, Robert E.
Bliley, Jerry W.
Borton, Robert E., Jr.
Boyd, Terran R.
Brandt, Craig M.
Briggs, Robert J.
Brighton, Edward E., Jr.
Burbick, Donald C.
Byrne, James F.
Caldwell, Ray L.
Canale, Vincent T.
Chapin, Faxon D., Jr.
Chiodo, Peter T.
Coleman, Charles M., Jr.
Creal, Albert F., Jr.
Cribbin, Thomas M.
Cross, Martin J.
Day, Maxie S.
Dewing, James T., Jr.
Doares, Joseph M., Jr.
Drucis, Timothy J.
Dunkle, Charles T.
Earhart, Terry L.
Field, Leroy F., Jr.
Figueroa, Ernest L.
Fish, Herbert E., III
Fitzgerald, Robert C.
Gabor, John B., Jr.
Gallagher, Patrick F.
Getts, Donald W.
Gibbins, Donald B.
Ginchereau, Eugene H.
Ginn, Donna K.
Gladstone, Kenneth M.
Glover, Clarence H., Jr.
Gordon, John E.
Gorham, Robert L.
Graber, James E.
Grandy, Emmett W., III
Greenwood, Alan R.
Hallahan, Jeffrey W.
Hamilton, Howard H.
Harper, Philip B.
Harris, Christopher B.
Hartwell, William R.
Helm, Robert C.
Hoffler, Robert E.
Holloway, Eugene C., III
Hopkins, Bruce A.
Hunter, Don L.
Jaffin, Frederick T., Jr.
- Jarvis, William E.
Jensen, Albert L.
Joerg, Joseph J., Jr.
Jones, Gary P.
Kauppi, David O.
King, James M.
Kosmark, Alfred C.
Krejci, Stanley L.
Lacey, Donald O., Jr.
Laehn, David R.
Leedy, Homer P.
Leverett, Guinn O., Jr.
MacKenzie, Edward H., III
MacMurray, Michael M.
Magrogan, William F., Jr.
Maitland, James R.
Mantonya, Robert R.
Martin, Ralph S.
Massie, Kent B.
Mathias, Edward J.
McCowan, William B., Jr.
McDonald, John F.
McWhorter, Paula L.
Meter, Charles M.
Mizer, Robert J.
Monahan, Frank J.
Moore, Stephen D.
Moutrie, Robert J.
Murray, Michael A.
Murray, Phillips S.
Murray, Thomas O., Jr.
Michael, Robert H.
Notar, Ernest J.
Nunnally, Thomas M.
Oehler, John J.
Olson, Jack E.
Palmerlee, David F.
Perry, Bradford K.
Perry, James H., Jr.
Pfann, William M.
Pomerantz, Ernest H.
Ponder, Joseph E.
Potter, Thomas L.
Privater, Charles R.
Quinton, Edmund F.
Rebarick, William P.
Rehbock, Philip F.
Reiersen, John E.
Roesinger, Stephen J.
Rowell, Dexter R.
Sampson, Thomas W.
Schaefer, John F.
Schmiege, Thomas J.
Shapack, Richard A.
Smith, Charles E.
Snyder, Ivan J., Jr.
Solomon, Robert L.
Stanley, John A.
Syrko, Peter M.
Tate, Alfred W.

Terwilliger, Bruce K., Jr.
Thornburgh, Robert W., Jr.
Trager, Douglas H.
Trandum, William I.
Vaughan, Woodrow W., Jr.

Veum, Douglas E.
Walker, Francis A.
Walker, Francis D., III
Watt, Peter K.
Welch, William R.
Wilde, Charles L.
Wilkinson, Ronald C.
Williams, Jilson L.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Barron, Richard M.
Bielen, Theodore J., Jr.
Browne, David L.
Clay, Joseph V. F.
Clayton, James B.
Delmanzo, Donald D., Jr.
Dillman, Robert P.
Ebersbaker, Jerry C.
Fausett, Stephen A.
Gaither, Thomas A.
Gallen, Robert M.
Green, Joseph B., Jr.
Guglielmino, Richard
Hadbavny, Ronald S.
Hall, Mark W.
Herrell, Orval G.
Hibbard, George P.
Jacobs, Paul F.
Jerabek, Frank J.
Klink, Warren H.
Long, Thomas A., Jr.

Lotterhand, Stephen F.
Lutz, John R.
Martin, William D.
McLaughlin, Terrence A.
Merback, Michael A.
Mitchum, William R., III
Olsen, Ole L.
Poppel, Robert W.
Rein, David A.
Runberg, Bruce L.
Schofield, Dean A.
Sheaff, David F.
Simmons, Bradley W.
Swartz, Floyd E., Jr.
Walkington, Ronald E.
Williams, William H., Jr.
Zane, Sheldon S. H.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Duley, John W., Jr.
Karch, Larry L.
Martorano, Francis J.

McIntosh, Wilton W.
Palmer, Timothy T.
Pitts, Lucius L., II

NURSE CORPS

Linehan, Patricia A.

The following named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the line or staff corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

William W. Aabye
David W. Ackerman
Ralph W. Ackley, Jr.
James A. Ader, Jr.
Fred L. Aelits
George W. Albright, Jr.
John R. C. Albright
Dennis J. Alexander
Donald L. Alf
George T. Allen
Thomas E. Allen
Don R. Anderson
Lane S. Anderson III
Richard A. Anderson
Scott K. Anderson, Jr.
Stanley I. Anderson
William M. Anderson
Richard L. Andrews
Frank T. Andrix
Ross M. Annable
Nicholas M. Aracic
John R. Aranyos
Donald K. Artley
James R. Atwill, Jr.
Jerome M. Auerbach
Neil E. Auten
Gary L. Averett
Edward H. Ayd
Larry L. Ayres
Steven E. Ayres
Robert F. Baarson
Albert M. Bacco
Fred S. Badman
Bruce R. Bafus
Terry M. Baggett, Jr.
Robert T. Bailes
William F. Bailey, Jr.
Albe B. Bakeman
Richard B. Baker
Lance G. Baldwin
Vincent J. J. Balukonis
Jay Barabash
George M. Barilla
Terrell W. Barlow

John B. Barnes*
Larry R. Barnes
Robert C. Barnes, Jr.
Richard C. Barr, Jr.
Dean J. Bauer
William T. Baynes
Marvin E. Beasley
William E. Beatty III
Peter J. Becker
Steven C. Beers
Roderick K. Beldier
William M. Belding, Jr.
Alan E. Bellinoff*
Dan T. Bergstrom
Richard P. Berg
Clay E. Bernichon
Robert L. Berry
Richard W. Beshore II
Peter P. Bibbo
Charles O. Birchmier
Kenneth L. Black
Charles M. Blackford
IV
Donald W. Blackwood
Dana R. Blair
James L. Blakesley
Norman L. Bleier
George H. Blume II
Lawrence P. Blumette
Jeffrey G. Bodie
Aubrey W. Bogle III
David A. Boillot
Theron C. Bone
William S. Bonnell
David E. Borak
Ronald D. Borden
Lee J. Bordenave
Robert E. Bourne, Jr.
Robert F. Bott
Donald W. Bouldin
Patrick B. Brady, Jr.
Gary L. Brandt
William C. Brant
David K. Bratzler
John K. Bray
Thomas J. Breagy
Gerard J. Brett

William E. Brew
James W. Bridges, Jr.
Joseph J. Broadhead III
Thomas M. Brogan
John E. Brookman
Clinton W. Brooks, Jr.
Robert L. Brown
Richard B. Bubeck
Steven L. Buck
Ian Bulger
Homer D. Burge, Jr.
Robert G. Burke
James B. Burkholder, Jr.
Richard H. Burn
David S. Burnett, Jr.
Charles A. Burns
Edward T. Burns
Kenneth L. Burton
Phillip T. Buss
Richard S. Butryn
Mark L. Byars
Alan S. Cameron
Jay A. Campbell
Dean H. Carlson
James A. Carmody
Paul N. Carr
Eric B. Carriker
Laurence B. Carroll III
Martin M. Casey
Natale M. Ceglie, Jr.
Robert L. Centner
Donald E. Chamberlain
Eugene W. Chappell, Jr.
William W. Chastain
Robert J. Cheever, Jr.
Michael A. Church
James E. Churchill
Cecil A. Clabaugh
James R. Claffee
William R. Clapp
Alexander B. Clark III
Ernest C. Clark III
Richard O. Clark
Edward L. Cleary, Jr.
John A. Cliff
Joseph M. Cline
Melvin A. Coble
Deford E. Cochran
Matthew J. Coffey, Jr.
Barry W. Cole
Stephen C. Coley
Ralph Collins, Jr.
Robert G. Colvert
Robert M. Combs
Robert M. Conaway
John N. Constans
Douglas V. Z. Coonrad
Lucien W. Courtney
Kenneth L. Cox
Gary M. Crahan
George K. Crain II
*Bowen S. Crandall
Jr.
Alan Creutz
Russell W. Crooks, Jr.
Bruce R. Crowe
Sidney S. Cutler
Norman H. Dahlgren, Jr.
Frank W. Dahlinger III
John L. Dale
Charles A. Daly
Jeffrey Daniels
Roy O. Darby III
Albert K. Davis
David H. Davis
Edwin S. Davis, Jr.
Joseph C. Davis
Thomas R. Davidson
Thomas N. Daymont
Brian R. Deacon
Joel C. Defreytas, Jr.
Kenneth E.
Degraffenreid
James F. Delehaunty
Terry J. Delph

Lee W. Demarest
John R. Dempsey
Frank G. Dengler
Allen D. Denmark
Edwin Deryke
Edgar P. Devylder, Jr.
Robert T. Dilley II
David R. Dishman
Warren B. Dodson
James E. Doe
Daniel B. Doherty
Robert J. Donnelly
William M. Donnelly
Walter F. Doran
Hugh J. Doyle
Robert C. Doyle
Ronald L. Drew
Jack D. Drummond III
William F. Dufresne
John H. Duncan
William L. Dunker
Peter H. Dunn
Robert S. Durst II
Ross T. Dwyer III
James R. Dybdal
William R. Eagan, Jr.
Terry P. Eargle
John P. Earle
Jon A. Eastman
Peter B. Eckel
Richard A. Edelman
Robert W. Edsall, Jr.
David E. Edwards
James R. Edwards
William T. Egan, Jr.
Laszlo J. Eger, Jr.
Paul Eisenhardt
Robert E. Elliott III
Timothy D. Elliott
Michael A. Ellis
Donald E. Emerson, Jr.
George A. Emerson, Jr.*
William P. Enderlein
Arnold E. Enfield
Bernard E. Erb, Jr.
David M. Erickson
Carl H. Ertwine
Ernest L. Eustis, III
Patrick L. Evans
James R. Everly
Joel E. Ewan
Frank A. Ewbank
Robert D. Fagan
Edward A. Fagyal, Jr.
William J. Fallon
Robert A. Far
Michael J. Farmer
Bruce G. Faulk
Robert A. Ferguson, Jr.
Richard M. Fessenden
Richard M. Fifer
Edward B. Fischer
Mark W. Fisher
Donald J. Fitzgerald
John M. Fitzgerald
John S. Fitzgerald
Kenneth W. Fitzgerald
Thomas E.
Fitzpatrick, Jr.
Robert L. Flanagan
Merle E. Flandermeyer
Arthur V. Flotte, III
Thomas J. Flynn
Stanley F. Folker, Jr.
Raymond F. Fortin
Jeffrey E. Fossum
Howard R. Foster
Jonathan P. Fowler
Curtis W. Frandsen
Oliver J. Freckman*
Ronald D. Frederick
Timothy A. French
Leonard G. Friedel
Richard W. Friedman
Curtis P. Fritsch, III
Donald E. Fry
Glen F. Fuerstneau
Richard B. Funk
Neil J. Gaffney

Thomas A. Gagnon
Stephen B. Gallagher
Richard M. Garwood
Donald S. Gaw
Kenneth G. Geel
Jack K. Gelman
Robert L. George
James J. German
James R. Gifford
Richard J. Gilbert
Donald A. Giles
Robert M. Gillaspie
Newton G. Gill
Nicholas B. Gilliam
Christopher W. Gilluly
Thomas R. Gish
Gomer T. Givens, Jr.
John F. Glarner
Richard J. Glaser
Norman R. Glass, Jr.
Peter J. Gior
James R. Glover, Jr.
Frederick G. Gluck
Robert W. Goehring, Jr.
Rex C. Gold
Ronald M. Goldberg
Edward J. Golding III
James W. Gossett
William D. Gottschalk
Richard A. Govers
Richard J. Goy
Gary R. Grable
James C. Graves
Michael E. Gray
Francis C. Green, II
George C. Green
William T.
Gregory, III
Robert E. Griswold
Daniel E. Graham
Lance C. Grunge
Steve Guch
William B. Guls
Gilbert G. Gulick
Robert J. Gunn
William R. Gustafson
Edward W.
Gutellus, Jr.
Theodore W. Hack
William S. Haines
Robert C. Hall
Stephen M. Hall
Gerald T. Hallenbeck
John W. Hamilton, III
Roger H. Hamm
Don C. Hammer
Carl H. Hammert
Henry V. Hamrick
Michael R. Hanchuck
Charles A. Hansen
Robert W. Hansen
Ryan L. Hanson
William E. Harris
Joseph E. Hart, Jr.
William G. Hart
James T. Hartnett
Daniel G. Harvey, Jr.
Robert B. Hawkins
Dale R. Hayden
Roderick J. Hayslett
Michael M. Hefferman
Jerome R. Heinan
Alan L. Heisig
David A. Heller
Nicholas M. Hellmuth
Glenn D. Hemme
Richard L. Henderson
Thomas E. Henrickson
Robert F. Henry
Richard J. Heydt
Douglas G. Hiatt
James N. Higdon
Dennis G. Hillberg
Louie C. Hinson
Kenneth J. Hintz
Christopher W.
Hoback
William J. Hoban
John W. Hoeche
Thomas A. Hoffner
Stephen J. Holm

Michael H. Holmes
Thomas J. Horn
Robert J. Horne
Joseph N. Hosteny
Arthur P. Howard
Michael W. Howell
Gerald P. Hudson
Richard M. Huebner
Forrest R. Huey
Edmond L. Hughes
William J. Hulsey
Russell D. Hulsing, II
Gerald F. Hunter, Jr.
Kem G. Hunter
George W. Huntington
John O. Huston, III
Walter E. Hughes
Richard A. Hutchins
Jimmy R. Hutchinson
John S. Huyler, Jr.
Vernon L. Ingersoll, Jr.
Alan L. Inglis
Clinton W. Inouye
Phillip J. Irish
David J. Ishley
Curtis L. Iverson
Thomas R. Jackson
Francis T. Jacobs
Stephen E. Jacobson
Kenneth V. Jaeggli, Jr.
Harrison W. James III
Joseph M. Jaros
Frank W. Jenks III
Paul E. Jensen
Adrian W. Johnson, Jr.
Darold L. Johnson
Ernest F. A. Johnson
John A. Johnson
John M. Johnson
Kenneth V. Johnson
Frederick J. Jones
Kenneth L. Jones
Lester L. Joos
Jerry C. Jordan
Michael A. Judge
Michael A. June
Allan E. Junker
Richard J. Jupa
James P. Kaczorowski
Christian E. Kaefner
Karl A. Kall IV
Jack K. Kalman
John E. Kane
Raymond W. Kane
John D. Kavanagh
Terrence M. Keegan
Alan C. Keller
John L. Keithly
Richard C. Kelleher
James S. Kelly
Lawrence M. Kelly
Robert J. Kelsey
John M. Kemp
John C. Kennerly
Richard M. Kenyon
John E. Kerr
Michael L. Kersey
Roy A. Kershaw
Charles J. Kice
David A. Killen
Charles B. King
Willis T. King, Jr.
Richard S. Kinney
James E. Kirkendall, Jr.
Kris A. Kirkland
Philip B. Kivlin
James J. Klausner
Edward M. Kline, Jr.
David A. Kluck
Charles F. Knigge
William R. Koch
Gary W. Kohut
Richard J. Komorowski
Donald W. Konz
John A. Kramer
Robert A. Kramer, Jr.
Robert O. Kratochvil
Joseph Krenz

Donald M. Kruse, Jr.
John A. Kuhlmann
Alan D. Kunkel
James R. Kyper
Francis W. Lacroix
Robert B. Lamason
William E. Lamb, Jr.
Peter S. Lamprou
Stephen R. Land
Ronny D. Lankford
David L. Larson
Larry C. Larson
Gilbert P. Lauzon
William L. Lavicka
James M. Laws
John F. Lawson
David H. Layton, Jr.
Arthur S. Lazrow
Michael R. Lazork
Frederick J. Leach
James A. Leal
Charles A. Lee
Michael R. Lee
Harvey B. Lemon
James B. Lepley, Jr.
William J. Lester
Donald F. Lewis
Robert V. Libert
William H. Lightstone
Jon E. Lindstrom
Andre R. Liotard
Helm Lipa
Lee G. Litzler
Robert L. Lloyd, Jr.
Alan A. Loch
Jerry A. Lohla
John L. Losquadro
James E. Love
Robert P. Lowe
Bruce B. Ludwig
Malcolm C. Mackey
Jerome P. Madden
Samuel H. S. Magruder
Samuel J. Major, Jr.
James W. Mangimeli
Stanley R. Mann
Frank A. Marsh
James T. Marshall
Lee B. Marshall
John E. Martin, Jr.
Kenneth W. Martin
Peter M. Martin
William C. Marx
Frank H. Maskiell, Jr.
Charles R. Mason
Richard H. Mason
Ronald L. Mattioda
Kenneth S. Mattson
Wilbert J. Matz, Jr.
Gary L. Mayes
David R. Mayhood
Lawrence B.
McArthur, Jr.
Martin J. McLean
David P. McCormack
William J.
McDermond, Jr.
Michael P. McDermott
Patrick M.
McDermott
Harold B. McEver
Kevin J. McGarity
James C. McGee, III
Albert S. McKalg, III
Jerome S. McKee
David R. McKenzie
William S. McKinnon
Howard J.
McLaughlin, Jr.
James M. McLaughlin
James T. McLaughlin
Roland M. McLean
Robert H. McNamara
Geoffrey M. Meade
Robert P. Meadows
Patrick H. Meehan
Richard J. Melners
James R. Meyer
Kenneth J. Meyer
Robert W. Micken
James E. Miles

Joseph A. Millen
Bruce M. Miller
Gary W. Miller
Howard S. Miller
Sanfrid J. Milton
Theodore A. Mitchell
Stephan J. Moden
James D. Montgomery, Jr.
David H. Moomy
Frederick J. Moore
Gary A. Moore
George D. Moore
Michael W. Moore
Thomas J. Morgan
Thomas J. Moroney
Gary R. Morrow
Thomas S. Moser
Hugh R. Muir
Aidan T. Murphy
Michael C. Murphy
Ronald C. Mussig
Richard N. Myers
Guy E. Mysilvy
Brian K. Nakano
Robert N. Nead
Kenneth Nebel
David C. Necker
David S. Nekomoto
Kenneth E. Neumann
William J. Neville, Jr.
Christopher A. Niehaus
John M. Nisbet, Jr.
George A. Noe, Jr.
Raymond J. Noel, Jr.
Jon P. Noerager
Michael A. Nolte
Gerald L. Nordland
Glenn E. Nordling
William J. Norris
John G. Northgraves
Richard W. Nowak
William J. Nucliarone
Richard F. Obenchain, Jr.
Michael F. O'Brien
Blaine J. O'Connell
Thomas C. O'Connor, Jr.
Henry V. Oheim, Jr.
Douglas A. Oldfield
John A. Olshinski
Arthur E. Osiecki
Carl J. Olson
Thomas Opladen
Franklin J. Pacenza
Ralph K. Packard, Jr.
Loren H. Page
David C. Palmer
Rhoderick A. Parker
Robert A. Parker
Lawrence E. Paryz
Benjamin W. Part-ridge III
Donald P. Paskewitz
Kent A. Paulsen
Richard G. Pearson
William D. Pederson
John L. Pedrick, Jr.
Doyle D. Peel
Richard H. Pelszynski
Daniel M. Pence
James C. Perisho
Arne M. Peterson
Frank J. Peterson
John R. Peterson
Robert K. Pezold
Dale R. Phillips
George S. Phillips, Jr.
Paul G. Pierce
Douglas A. Plummer
Don P. Pollard
Thomas R. Pomaski
Dennis D. Porter
John C. Porter
Lincoln Y. Porter
Ronald D. Porter
John E. Potter II
Mark G. Prestero
Carl H. Preston

Stephen M. Pribula
Robert H. Pride
Charles R. Priest
Brian T. Prinn
John M. Psotto
Charles R. Rabel
Allan N. Rae
David M. Rains
James E. Rambo
*Ronald C. Ramsey
Robert E. Rankin
George A. Rasmussen
John J. Raymond
Andrew F. Reardon
Myron C. Reed
John F. Reeder
Kenneth R. Reim
James R. Reinauer
James F. Reinhardt
Donald J. Rhoads
Nicholas R. Ribaud
Jeffrey L. Richard
Jesse M. Richards III
Jeffrey R. Richardson
Elwood B. Rickards, Jr.
Michael V. Riggio
Robert T. Riggs
Warren A. Robb
Franklin W. Roberts
Gary L. Robertson
Terry G. Robertson
Craig S. Roepke
Allen W. Roessig, Jr.
George C. Rogers, Jr.
William L. Rogers
Claude T. Rollen
Thomas E. Rooney
Joseph P. Rubano
Hugh B. Ruckman III
Richard B. Rump, Jr.
Frederic L. Ruskin
Paul Russell
Robert D. Russell, Jr.
Nelson C. Salez
Michael R. Samide
Hyrum C. Sandberg
Thomas W. Sanders
John F. Sandoz
James K. Sands
Joseph H. Santarlaschi, Jr.
Michael A. Santiago
David A. Saponara
James L. Sawin
John T. Sawyer
Lowell T. Schaefer
David C. Schleeter
Rowland F. Schlegel, Jr.
Martin F. Scheinholtz
John E. Schmidt
William W. Schmidt
Roy R. Schminky
Lee W. Schrank
Peter A. Schranz
William H. Schriever
Charles R. Schrimper
Carl J. Schulz
Robert E. Schunter
Jay B. Schwartz
Frank D. Schwikert
Ronald L. Scott
Stephen D. Seery
John C. Sell
Richard L. Sellers
George P. Semerai
Howard C. Serkin
Frank B. Sewall
James W. Sharon
James R. Sharp
Victor L. Sharp
Charles P. Shaw
Mark C. Shaw
Robert E. Shaw
James T. Sheddian, Jr.
John T. J. Shedlosky
Daniel B. Sheehan, Jr.
*John R. Shelton
Peter A. Shepard

John M. Sherm, Jr.
William K. Sherman
Paul A. Shields
Ted G. Shown
Roy D. Sikkink
Phillip W. Simonds
Donald C. Simoneaux
Jon F. Silverberg
Lee J. Sippel
Richard A. Skalleberg
James M. Skelly
Robert L. Skinner
Carl J. Smith
Cordell C. Smith
Donald S. Smith
Edward W. Smith III
Frank W. Smith III
John R. Smith
Joseph F. Smith, Jr.
Kerneth A. Smith
Nathan W. Smith
Richard C. Smith
Richard T. Smith
Terry L. Smith
Wickham G. Smith
Michael A. Smolak
Robert C. Smolen
Douglas S. Snider
Sidney E. Snook
Michael A. Sobyra
Anthony M. Sorce
Michael A. Sowada
Dennis E. Spangler
Steven H. Spayd
Charles H. Speace
Paul J. Springman
Alden L. Sproul
Patrick C. Stacker
Steven L. Stamm
Kenneth R. Stanfield
Laird W. Stanton
John F. Stasowski
Wayne P. Starke
David H. Starr III
Charles M. Statton, Jr.
Carl D. Stearns
Paul W. Steckley
Leif M. Steintert
Edward C. Stelberg
Ben F. Stephens, Jr.
Melville L. Stephens
Lawrence W. Stevens
William A. Stevens
Herbert S. Stevenson
John D. Steward
Michael A. Stieber
Richard G. Stieglitz
Peter B. Stock
Roger W. Stokes
Robert E. Stoll, Jr.
Bruce T. Stone
John C. Stone
Robert J. Storan
Ivar E. Strand, Jr.
Robert L. Stright
William H. Strobel, Jr.
James W. Sturges
James C. Stutts, II
William R. Sugnet
Michael P. Sullivan
William A. Sullivan, Jr.
Michael K. Sutherland
Joseph E. Sutika
William A. Svoboda
James R. Swank
William J. Swanson
Carl F. Swenson
John E. Talpsky
Kenneth W. Tapscott
Clarence E. Taylor
Earl T. Taylor, Jr.
Harry B. Teare
Thomas W. Teneyck, Jr.
James H. Tess
John C. Thiele
Larry W. Thomas
William J. Thomas
Arthur L. Thorsen

Stephen L. Thumb
Jeffrey E. Tieger
Carroll G. Titsworth
Fred W. Titus, Jr.
David M. Todd
Walter W. Tomiak
Thomas A. Toporowski
Eliot F. Tozer, III
Michael L. Trahan
Stanley J. Tracz
James H. Trenholme
Ross L. Trimby
Courtney L. Tucker
Oscar D. Turner, Jr.
William E. Turner
George D. Uffenorde
John J. Uhrin, III
Herbert L. Ulmer
Lawrence W. Urbik
Richard B. Uris
Richard W. Van-Leuvan
John G. VanNatta, II
James R. VanSant
David VanSaun
David E. Vaughn
David L. Vennard
John C. Vinson
Bruce R. Volkart
Ronald M. Vranich
John A. Vuyosevich
Bernard D. Wagner
John P. Walsh, Jr.
Richard J. Walsh
Chester D. Ward
Irving D. Warden, Jr.
Walter M. Wasowski
Robert C. Watson
Thomas E. Watt
Richard D. Webb
Abbott M. Webber, Jr.
Bernard A. Webber

Dana L. Webster
William S. Welkel
William M. Weinberg
Stuart Weisberg
Cyril F. Wells
Robert E. Wells
Alan C. Werb
Morris A. Weseloh
Frank H. Weston, Jr.
Stephen F. Weston
John F. Whaley
*Roger L. Wharton
Douglas G. Whgdahl
William J. White, III
Thomas J. Whittle
Russell T. Whitney
Arthur E. Wickerham
Wallace L. Wikoff
*David M. Williams
Ronald D. Williams
Steven A. Williams
Laramie M. Winczewski
Albert J. Wittwer
Kenneth A. Wood, Jr.
Edmund B. Woolen
Wiley G. Woolsey, Jr.
Johnathan W. Wooten
Thomas S. Yarborough, Jr.
Russell C. York
Steven C. York
Robert M. Young
Grant H. Youngman
Bradley H. Zebal
Michael B. Zemetra
Woodrow W. Zenfell, Jr.
Eric B. Zimny
Lawrence E. Zins
Richard E. Zuckerman

The following-named graduates from Navy enlisted scientific education program to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert R. Allen
Richard F. Ashford, Jr.
Lawrence S. Beers
Patrick H. Bellew
James C. Berryman
John M. Boggio
Malvin L. Bray
James L. Bruun
Numa A. Boudreaux, III
Lee A. Carpenter
Robert K. Carter
Robert A. Desilets
Lawrence P. Dorsett
Warren W. Fifield
William B. Godfrey
Michael G. Hardin
Danny R. Harmon
Richard T. Hernlund, Jr.
Gordon L. Holmes
James W. Johnson
Richard J. Keefe
Earle W. Knobloch
William M. Lane
Leo J. Lehman
Robert S. Logan

Thomas E. McCorkell
Webster R. McGee
Philip R. Marshall
Charlie R. Martin
Donald A. Moses
Kenneth L. Nichols
Ronald W. Norman
Donald P. Ohnemus
Donald E. Olbert
Dennis A. Olttraver
Robert J. Pisz
Thomas E. Prall
Thomas L. Rhamy
Darryl L. Roberts
Stanley J. Romanowski
Calvin H. Romans
Gary A. Sampson
Ronald J. Schemmel
Donald F. Scott
James E. Speight
Allen E. Taylor
Leon J. Uplinger
Steven "G" Walter
Joe F. Ward
Edward M. West

*William V. Erickson, midshipman (Naval Academy) to be a permanent ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

*David S. Howard (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

*Giuseppe Turchi (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant commander and a temporary commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenant commanders and temporary commanders in the

Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

David O. Childers *Warren W. Hamilton,
*Vernon H. Fitchett Jr.
*Robert R. Fowler *Edward J. Sullivan

The following named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants and temporary lieutenant commanders in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*John D. Carlson *Richard J. Seeley
*Jesse A. Marcel, Jr. *John P. Smith
*Robert H. Pine *Brent A. Welch

The following named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*William E. Billings, *Warner G. Laster
Jr. *Kenneth L. Mayes
*Robert H. Cave

The following named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*"A" Dean Anderson *Paul A. Kandler
*Douglas E. Barnard *Elmer F. Klein, Jr.
*Kenneth J. Billings *Stanley "J" Kreider
*Kenneth K. Birchard *Joseph L. Krueger
Jr. *Richard W. Lucey
*Charles W. Bollinger *John E. Lytle
*Mack Bonner, Jr. *Michael P. McCarthy
*John J. Bouvier *James S. McGinn
*Alphonse H. L. Bruno, *Paul L. Majewski
Jr. *Francis G. Mannarino
*Jay "B" "V" Butler, *Michael A. Milek
Jr. *Douglas A. Miller
*Thomas H. Byrnes, Jr. *William W. Miller
*Walker H. Campbell *Edward G. Mor-
*Richard E. Carlson hauser
*Ronald J. Cavanagh *Malcolm M. Murdoch
*Charles T. Cloutier *William M. Murphy
*Jack R. Collins Jr.
*John D. Conger *Ralph A. Nelson
*Thomas E. Corley *John J. O'Neill
*Charles T. Covington *Richard D. Paolillo
*Francis M. Criswell *Lynn M. Phelps
*Howard P. Cupples *Joel R. Poole
*Clayton F. Drake, Jr. *Ted T. Pridmore
*Christopher W. Due- *Russell J. Reit
ker *Charles A. Rend
*William B. Echols *Lawrence R. Rubel
*Roger W. English *Stephen R. Ryter
*Crayton A. Fargason *David A. Sharbo
*Richard L. Fassett *Joseph A. Shields, Jr.
*Louis C. Fischer *Jerry R. Smith
*Theodore L. Folkert *Donald F. Sprafke
*David R. Foreman *Wilbur Suesberry
*Alfred R. Frankel *Frederick J. Tanz
*David F. Garvin *Carroll S. Tuten
*Charles C. Gay *Richard W. Virgilio
*Bruce R. Geer *Richard C.
*Hugh E. Gleaton, Jr. Waterbury
*Leonard J. Gosink *Ronald L. Wax
*James L. Hauser *Robert D. Wertz
*Walter D. Henrichs *David P. West
*William W. Holm *Francis D. Wilken
*Reese E. James *Paul F. Williams
*Ray M. Johnson *James L. Wise, Jr.
*Edward P. Juras

*James N. Falkenburg (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant (junior grade) and a temporary lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

*George C. Morrison (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants and temporary lieutenant commanders in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*John T. Stevens
*Raymond C. Terhune

The following named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the

Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*James R. Holtan *Milton C. VanMeter,
*Leslie D. Propp Jr.
*Carl M. Trepagnier Charles H. Zois
*William G. Simpson

The following named temporary commissioned warrant officers to be appointed permanent chief warrant officers, W-4, in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert F. Molen Leroy C. Richey
Orlando L. Palombo Curtis H. Sims

The following named temporary commissioned warrant officers to be appointed permanent chief warrant officers, W-3, in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Howard P. Cady Michael Shontz
Frank R. Ketterer Frank Stephens, Jr.
John C. Milligan Willard F. Wasson
Wayne E. Myers Heber D. White

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named (Army Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Richard F. Liebler

The following named (platoon leaders class) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John M. Allen Michael P. Holland
Lester E. Amick III Richard G. Hoopes
James L. Anderson Raymond A. Hord
Stephen L. Austin Ralph M. Jeide
Richard G. Averitt III Timothy L. Johnson
Ronnie J. Bailey Ivan M. Jones, Jr.
John J. Banning Edward R. Kenney
James H. Beaver Gerald L. Keys
David L. Bjork Edmond A. Kinsella,
Eugene S. Blasdel Jr.
William C. Bradford Lynn E. Kinzig
James A. Brinson, Jr. John J. Kispert, Jr.
Richard M. Brown Richard O. Laing
Kenneth H. Bruner John P. Larison
Donald J. Buzney John C. Ledoux
Mark A. Byrd Francis E. Lewis
Robert W. Byrd John M. Lowman
Merritt N. Chafey Justin M. Martin II
Stephen M. Chase Donald J. Matoccha
Bruce B. Cheever II Dennis M. McCarthy
John J. Cochenour Michael E. McClung
Thomas J. Costigan Thomas M. McEntire
Richard R. Crawford James H. McKelligon
Herbert T. Cross Steven S. McMahan
William L. Davila Daniel D. McMurray
Dellwyn L. G. Davis Wallace W. Mills
Lee H. Des Bordes, Jr. John W. Monk, Jr.
John H. Diez Francis A. Mooney
Michael J. Dineen Ronald H. Morgan
Stuart A. Dorow Bruce C. Murray
David T. Dotson, Jr. Dennis R. Muvich
Wayne C. Doyle Rafael Negron, Jr.
Darryl F. Dziedzic James H. O'Brien, Jr.
George T. Eastment Jerry G. Paccassi II
III Matt Parker III
John R. Fogg Anthony J. Pesavento
John J. Folan, Jr. David W. Peters
Claude R. Fridley John E. Peterson, Jr.
Leonard R. Fuchs, Jr. John C. Powers
William J. Ganter, Jr. James T. Ransstead
Robert J. Garing Joseph V. Reasbeck
David M. Gee III
George F. Getgood Richard L. Reeh
Robert E. Gleisberg Durwood W. Ringo, Jr.
William A. Good Richard J. Robert, Jr.
Robert L. Graler Benjamin T. Roberts
Alfred Grieshaber, Jr. Joe D. Robinson
Jimmie C. Gulliford David R. Rood
Robert W. Harris William G. Ross
Carl J. Hasdovic Steven R. Sanford
John R. Heintz, Jr. John F. Schofield, Jr.
Michael K. Higgins William C. Sellmer II
Klaus P. Hille Richard A. Sergio
Charles O. Hoelle, Jr. Robert J. L. Shuman
Harold C. Holden Kenneth L. Shackel-
John N. Holladay ford, Jr.

Paul F. Skoog
Kenneth A. Solum
John G. Spindler
Helge R. Swanson
Robert F. Thompson
William G. Thrash, Jr.
Dick A. Tracy
Douglas C. Vassy
Thomas P. Wilbor

Gustave J. Willemín,
Jr.
Joe P. Williams, Jr.
Michael M. Williamsen
John D. Wintersteen
William K. Wonders
Alin C. Worley
John W. Wuethrich
Walter R. Young, Jr.

The following named (Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Raymond F. Baker
William C. Evans
Alan C. DeCrane

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 3, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I am the vine, ye are the branches. He that abideth in Me, and I in Him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without Me ye can do nothing.—John 15: 5.

O Lord, who art the source of light and life, and the fountain of peace and power, let Thy spirit arise within us as we worship Thee this moment. Open our hearts that we may receive the good seeds of Thy Word and let Thy spirit ripen them into the fruits of righteousness and love.

Prosper our Nation in all its life and work that there may be no want anywhere and favor us with Thy presence that good will may reign in the hearts of all our people.

Bless our President, our Speaker, and all these Representatives of our Nation—may they be filled with Thy spirit, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, of faith, and of love. Undergird us in our freedom that we may be forever the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Be Thou with us and may we be with Thee. In the name of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 23, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on March 29, 1967, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 273. Joint resolution to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments.

THE LATE HONORABLE PAUL MALONEY, SR.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection