trols and their activities. They also have a need and a right, however, to know the same about all other groups with Communist associations that are fomenting campus and urban rioting, the killing of police, the destruction of draft centers and other defense-related facilities by fire-bombings and explosives, the sabotage of U.S. policy and defense efforts in Viet Nam and other crucial areas, and which are working in various other ways to bring down the elected government of the United States.

COURT UPHOLDS BOARD ON FREE SPEECH ISSUE

On June 5, 1961, in a 5-to-4 decision [Communist Party vs. Subversive Activies Control Board (367 U.S. 1)] the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the registration provisions of the Subversive Activities Control Act as applied to the Communist party.

Justice Frankfurter, writing for the majority—himself and Justices Clark, Harlan, Whittaker and Stewart—rejected the Communist party's claim that the act violated the 1st Amendment and the Bill of Attainder provision of the Constitution and held that the 5th Amendment was not relevant to the facts of the case as they then stood.

The dissenting Justices—Warren, Black, Douglas and Brennan—wrote separate opinions, each claiming the act was unconstitutional on 5th Amendment grounds. Despite the "free speech" reputation of these men, only Justice Black also held that the act violated the 1st Amendment.

The following are excerpts from the majority and minority opinions on the 1st Amendment issue:

Justice Frankfurter: "Where the mask of anonymity which an organization's members wear serves the double purpose of protecting them from popular prejudice and of enabling them to cover over a foreign-directed conspiracy, infiltrate into other groups, and enlist the support of persons who would not, if the truth were revealed, lend their support, it would be a distortion of the 1st Amendment to hold that it prohibits Congress from removing the mask."

Justice Douglas, for the minority (excepting Justice Black): "If lobbyists can be required to register, if political parties can be required to make disclosure of the sources of their funds, if the owners of newspapers and periodicals must disclose their affiliates, so may a group operating under the control of a foreign power.

"The Bill of Rights was designed to give fullest play to the exchange and dissemination of ideas that touch the politics, culture and other aspects of our life. When an organization is used by a foreign power to make advances here, questions of security are raised beyond the ken of disputation and debate between the people resident here. Espionage, business activities, formation of cells for subversion, as well as the exercise of the 1st Amendment rights, are then used to pry open our society and make intrusion of a foreign power easy. These machinations of a foreign power add additional elements to free speech just as marching up and down adds something to picketing that goes beyond free speech.

"These are the reasons why, in my view, the bare requirements that the Communist party register and disclose the names of its officers and directors is in line with the most exacting adjudications touching 1st Amendment activities."

DISCLOSURE PRINCIPLE—THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS, 1947 REPORT

The principle of disclosure is, we believe, the appropriate way to deal with those who would subvert our democracy by revolution or by encouraging disunity and destroying the civil rights of some groups. . . .

The ultimate responsibility for countering totalitarians of all kinds rests, as always, with the mass of good, democratic Americans, their organizations and their leaders. The federal government . . . ought to provide a source of reference where private citizens and groups may find accurate information about the activities, sponsorship and background of those who are active in the market place of public opinion.

SENATE—*Friday, September 19, 1969*

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose glory fills this universe and the universes beyond, make us ever mindful also that Thou art the Creator of man and that Thou didst invest him with dignity and freedom when time began. Help us now to comport ourselves as children of Thy creation, to cherish our freedom, and to use it for the welfare of this Nation and the improvement of all mankind. Draw together into a firm spiritual alliance all who seek the peace and joy of the kingdom Thou hast promised to all who love and serve Thee. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 18, 1969, be dispensed with.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

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

PEACE CORPS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 409, H.R. 11039.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11039) to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "and", where it appears the second time, strike out "$101,100,000" and insert "$92,800,000"; in line 7, after the word "and", strike out "(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'None of the funds authorized to carry out the purposes of this Act shall be used to carry out the Volunteers to America Program conducted under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2451 et seq.), or any similar program involving the service or training of foreign nationals in the United States.'" and insert "(2) by inserting immediately after 'this Act' the following: 'and the Volunteers to America Program conducted under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (2 U.S.C. 2451)'."; on page 2, line 7, after "Section 5", insert "(h)"; in line 9, after the word "amended", strike out "as follows:"; at the beginning of line 10, strike out "(a) In subsection (h), immediately after '(31 U.S.C. 492a),', add 'the Act of October 21, 1968 (5 U.S.C. 5584) for purposes of erroneous payments of allowances provided under the Peace Corps Act,'." and insert "by inserting after '(31 U.S.C. 492a),' the following: 'section 5584 of title 5, United States Code (and readjustment allowances paid under this Act shall be considered as pay for purposes of such section),'."; and, after line 16, insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 301 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to the encouragement of voluntary service programs, is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended—

(A) by inserting immediately after "of this Act" the designation "(1)";

(B) by striking out the comma and the word "and" following "trained manpower" and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the designation "(2)"; and

(C) by striking out the period at the end thereof and substituting a semicolon and the following: "and (3) to encourage the development of, and participation in, any international program which seeks to provide volunteers to serve in less developed countries or areas, training, or other assistance in order

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

to help such countries or areas to meet their needs for trained manpower."

(2) Subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) (1) Activities carried out by the President in furtherance of the purposes of clauses (1) and (2) of subsection (a) of this section shall be limited to the furnishing of knowledge and skills relating to the selection, training, and programing of volunteer manpower. None of the funds available for use in the furtherance of such purposes may be contributed to any international organization or to any foreign government or agency thereof; nor may such funds be used to pay the costs of developing or operating volunteer programs of such organization, government, or agency, or to pay any other costs of such organization, government, or agency.

"(2) Not more than $300,000 may be used in fiscal year 1970 to carry out the provisions of clause (3) or subsection (a) of this section. Such funds may be contributed to educational institutions, private voluntary organizations, international organizations, and foreign governments or agencies thereof, to pay a fair and proportionate share of the costs of the international programs (of the type described in such clause) of such institutions, organizations, and governments or agencies."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the basic purpose of H.R. 11039, as amended, is to authorize the appropriation of $92,800,000 for the Peace Corps' fiscal year 1970 operations. Several other amendments to the Peace Corps Act are also added.

I submit for the RECORD a table comparing the amount requested with the authorizations and appropriations of prior years, and ask unanimous consent that it appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, it is to be noted that the original fiscal year 1970 request submitted by the previous administration was for $109,800,000. The committee was informed that the amended request for $101,100,000 was based on a careful review of Peace Corps programs overseas and a decision of host country and Peace Corps country officials to eliminate activities of marginal benefit in order to strengthen the overall program. As the table shows, this is not the first time that the Peace Corps has submitted an amended request. In the overall interest of reducing Government spending, the committee voted to decrease further the authorization to $92,800,000.

The funds requested are expected to support an estimated total of 12,000 volunteers and trainees in the 1970 program year, September 1, 1969, to August 31, 1970. The Peace Corps expects to train 7,500 new volunteers, an increase of 500 over the past program year.

The average cost to the Government of each volunteer is estimated to be $8,505, up $200 from $8,305, during the last program year. The breakdown between volunteer and project costs and administrative expenses appears on another table I submit, and ask unanimous consent that it appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

PEACE CORPS—STATEMENT OF AUTHORIZATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS

[Dollars in thousands]

Fiscal year	Original authorization and budget request	Amended budget	Amount recommended to Senate	Authorized	Appropriated (including reappropriations)	Appropriation transfers to GSA	Obligated as of June 30	Unobligated as of June 30	Reappropriated
1962	$40,000			$40,000	$30,000		$29,496	$504	
1963	63,750			63,750	59,000	$444	54,692	3,864	$3,864
1964	108,000	$102,000		102,000	95,964		76,164	19,800	17,000
1965	115,000	106,100		115,000	104,100	7	85,449	18,644	12,100
1966	125,200			115,000	114,100		113,173	927	
1967	110,500	112,150		110,000	110,000	104	104,525	5,371	
1968	124,400	118,700		115,700	107,500		106,846	654	
1969	112,800			112,800	102,000	49	101,951		
1970	109,800	101,100	$92,800						

SUMMARY OF OBLIGATIONS BY ACTIVITY

[Dollars in millions]

	Fiscal year—								
	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969[1]	1970
Volunteer and project costs	$19.7 (66.7)	$39.3 (71.9)	$58.4 (76.7)	$65.6 (76.8)	$89.6 (79.1)	$79.8 (76.4)	$78.2 (73.2)	$71.7 (70.3)	$70.5 (69.7)
Administrative expenses	9.8 (33.3)	15.4 (28.1)	17.8 (23.3)	19.8 (23.2)	23.6 (20.9)	24.7 (23.6)	28.6 (26.8)	30.3 (29.7)	30.6 (30.3)
Total	29.5	54.7	76.2	85.4	113.2	104.5	106.8	102.0	101.1

[1] Estimated.

Note: Figures in parentheses in percentage.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the committee notes that once again the percentage of administrative expenses to project costs has risen. While the committee was told that this rise is entirely due to the costs of Federal pay increases, the committee admonishes the Peace Corps not to become an organization of many chiefs and few Indians.

The Peace Corps is presently serving in 60 countries and areas and hopes to be in several more before the end of the program year. By area and countries the volunteers and trainees are distributed as shown on a third table that I ask unanimous consent may appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

VOLUNTEERS AND TRAINEES ON BOARD

Region/country	Volunteers overseas, June 30, 1968	Trainees, June 30, 1968	Total, June 30, 1968	Volunteers overseas, June 30, 1969	Trainees, June 30, 1969	Total, June 30, 1969	Volunteers overseas, June 30, 1970	Trainees, June 30, 1970	Total, June 30, 1970
Worldwide	11,115	2,708	13,823	9,882	2,433	12,315	9,250	2,525	11,775
Africa	2,924	814	8,738	2,626	826	3,452	2,525	425	2,950
Botswana	50	13	63	70		70	65	15	80
Cameroon	61		61	17	39	56	65		65
Chad	38	30	68	44	19	63	40	30	70
Congo							50		50
Dahomey	26		26	34	45	79	35		35
Ethiopia	389	347	736	431	60	491	420	25	445
Gambia, The	16		16	14	19	33	10		10
Ghana	242	106	348	172	134	306	175	65	240
Guinea					25	25	20		20
Ivory Coast	80	58	138	106	32	138	75	60	135
Kenya	253		253	281	19	300	275		275
Lesotho	66		66	58		58	60		60
Liberia	299		299	327	47	374	265		265
Malawi	123		123	139	42	181	125		125
Mauritius							35		35
Niger	156	13	169	77	21	98	70	15	85
Nigeria	248		248	103		103	50		50
Senegal	119	61	180	125	52	177	105	30	135
Sierra Leone	273	128	401	259	201	460	225	130	355
Somalia	73	34	107	68		68	85	25	110
Swaziland				45		45	40		40
Tanzania	143		143	11		11			
Togo	102	24	126	90	16	106	115	30	145
Uganda	123		123	104		104	65		65
Upper Volta	44		44	51	55	106	55		55

VOLUNTEERS AND TRAINEES ON BOARD—Continued

Region/country	Volunteers overseas, June 30, 1968	Trainees, June 30, 1968	Total, June 30, 1968	Volunteers overseas, June 30, 1969	Trainees, June 30, 1969	Total, June 30, 1969	Volunteers overseas, June 30, 1970	Trainees, June 30, 1970	Total, June 30, 1970
East Asia and Pacific	2,672	470	3,142	2,540	312	2,852	2,100	800	2,900
Fiji	51		51	156		156	145	40	185
Korea	310		310	264	32	296	190	100	290
Malaysia	495		495	490		490	505		505
Micronesia	625	393	1,018	355	255	580	300	320	620
Philippines	720	77	797	714	55	769	500	80	580
Thailand	228		228	328		328	300	20	320
Tonga	114		114	118		118	80	100	180
Western Samoa	129		129	115		115	80	100	180
New country								40	40
Nanesa	1,804	653	2,457	1,713	478	2,191	1,800	450	2,250
Afghanistan	171		171	204	34	238	150	30	180
Ceylon	42		42	35	13	48	45		45
India	750	176	926	585	74	659	735	50	785
Iran	167	97	264	196	87	283	145	40	185
Libya	13		13	172		172	195	170	365
Morocco	94	65	159	120		120	125		125
Nepal	179		179	160	71	231	185		185
Tunisia	230	129	359	113	88	201	135	40	175
Turkey	158	186	344	128	111	239	85	120	205
Latin America	3,715	771	4,486	3,003	817	3,820	2,825	850	3,675
Bolivia	219	142	361	239		239	185	115	300
Brazil	580	14	594	420	76	496	425	70	495
British Honduras	45	40	85	37		37	55	25	80
Chile	254	44	298	203	106	309	160	60	220
Colombia	576	16	592	516	34	550	400	20	420
Costa Rica	98		98	87	1	88	70	20	90
Dominican Republic	161	46	207	119	25	144	95	30	125
Eastern Caribbean	124	57	181	140	139	279	110	60	170
Ecuador	247	128	375	221		221	195	110	305
El Salvador	119	66	185	101	48	149	105	15	120
Guatemala	151	11	162	73	25	98	65	30	95
Guyana	51	44	95	44	51	95	55	40	95
Honduras	167	60	227	132	26	158	135	60	195
Jamaica	117	94	211	68	135	203	130	90	220
Nicaragua				35	1	36	35	15	50
Panama	174	4	178	133	47	180	140	20	160
Paraguay	56		56	69	16	85	65		65
Peru	283		283	174	7	181	200	70	270
Uruguay	31		31	13		13	10		10
Venezuela	262	5	267	179	80	259	190		190
New country									

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain excerpts from the committee report be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

NEW DIRECTIONS

As the Peace Corps nears its 10th anniversary, it is natural that there should be talk of reassessments and "new directions." The Peace Corps in large part grew out of a congressionally sponsored amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1960 which called on the President to arrange for a nongovernmental study on "the advisability and practicability of a program, to be known as Point Four Youth Corps, under which young U.S. citizens would be trained and serve abroad in programs of technical cooperation."

Technical skills.—The emphasis on providing technical skills, which was implied in the original concept, is one of the new directions being discussed by the Peace Corps Director. Since more mature and technically skilled individuals are likely to have families, which fact would normally disqualify them from being accepted as volunteers and able financially to serve, the Peace Corps plans to use the volunteer leader authority of section 6 of the Peace Corps Act. This section authorizes the President to enroll in the Peace Corps qualified persons whose services are required for supervisory or other special duties or responsibilities in connection with Peace Corps programs. Volunteer leaders receive a higher readjustment allowance $125 per month compared to $75 for volunteers) and may under exceptional circumstances be accompanied by their spouses and minor children who would be entitled to housing, subsistence, and other benefits.

The committee has no objection to the use of section 6 authority for a pilot program to attempt to meet the needs of less developed countries for more highly skilled manpower. The act itself limits the number of volunteer leaders to one for each 25 volunteers. But on the basis of experience with such a pilot program, the committee expects the Peace Corps to review carefully its legislative authority before the fiscal year 1971 authorization and propose changes if a radical departure from past programs is contemplated. After all, Congress intended section 6 to be applied to leaders of volunteers, and not to technical experts working in comparative isolation, and it does not construe "exceptional circumstances" to include the possession of higher skills. The Committee emphasizes that without a clear legislative mandate it would not look with favor on the Peace Corps being in competition with, or duplicative of, the Agency for International Development in the field of technical assistance.

Volunteers to America—a binational approach.—In 1966 the Peace Corps requested legislative authority to launch an "exchange Peace Corps" which would involve bringing volunteers from other countries for service in the United States on essentially the same conditions as the Peace Corps. The committee struck the request from the bill "without prejudice," noting that the authority exists * * * [in the Fulbright-Hays Act] for a program of this nature if the administration should find it a worthwhile undertaking." Under that authority, a small pilot program, called "Volunteers to America" (VTA), was begun. Sixty-four volunteers came in July 1967, 41 in July 1968 and about the same number are expected this year. More than half of them have come from Latin America, the rest from the Far East, Near East, and Africa. The sending country pays for preliminary orientation and international transportation, the U.S. Government pays for domestic U.S. travel and a training and orientation program, and local communities or agencies pay the volunteers' living allowances. The cost to the U.S. Government is estimated at $2,300 per VTA the first year and an additional $200 the second year if he extends his service. Fiscal year 1970 expenditures are estimated at $100,000.

The program has been directed and coordinated by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State. On the basis of experience, however, the State Department has concluded that this responsibility should be transferred to the Peace Corps and the Peace Corps concurs. Accordingly a delegation of authority has been issued by the Secretary of State to the Peace Corps Director. A minor amendment of the act is also involved to enable the Peace Corps to utilize its funds for programs conducted under the authority of the Fulbright-Hays Act.

Both the State Department and the Peace Corps consider the experience under this small program to have been successful and worthwhile. The Peace Corps in particular believes that it would benefit from its association with the volunteers to America program and enhance its acceptability abroad by receiving as well as sending volunteers. The Peace Corps has been steadily moving toward encouraging the host countries more and more to participate in every aspect of the Peace Corps—programing, selecting, training, and directing the volunteers. Involving the Peace Corps now in a volunteer-receiving activity would seem to be logical.

Toward a multinational approach.—With the binational approach as a first step toward broadening the receptivity of the Peace Corps, the committee searched for other means to broaden the scope of volunteer service. It noted that increasingly in recent years the Peace Corps has become a target of attacks in countries in which it serves. Also, there have been indications, that countries would welcome a multinational volunteer effort, and that recent graduates from American colleges would welcome the opportu-

nity to serve in such an effort. None of this is a reflection of the Peace Corps. Rather the committee was interested in opening new channels for volunteer efforts and lessening the conspicuousness of the American role abroad. The committee, therefore, recommends that Peace Corps attempt to work with other countries' volunteer services on team projects in countries interested in this approach.

The experience of working with a nationality mix of volunteers should provide the knowledge with which to determine whether a practical way can be found to give expression to the desire voiced by members of the United Nations to establish an international voluntary service. Such pilot projects would enrich the experience of our volunteers, as well as others, promote international cooperation, and make a greater variety of skills available to the interested countries. American volunteers engaged on such joint projects would, of course, remain Peace Corps volunteers.

To encourage exploration of possible joint projects the committee recommends adding a third purpose to title III, which relates to encouragement of voluntary service programs. This title already states that it is the policy of the United States (1) to encourage other countries to establish voluntary programs like the Peace Corps to help less developed countries and (2) to encourage less developed countries to establish their own volunteer programs. To this, the committee would add that it is also the purpose of the United States (3) "to encourage the development of, and participation in, any international program which seeks to provide volunteers to serve in less developed countries or areas, training, or other assistance in order to help such countries or areas to meet their needs for trained manpower."

The committee amendment would continue the prohibition on the use of funds for purposes (1) and (2) of that title, for which presently only knowlege and skills relating to the selection, training, and programing of volunteer manpower may be furnished. For the new purpose (3), however, the committee amendment would allow the use of up to $300,000 in fiscal year 1970. These funds may be contributed to educational institutions, private voluntary organizations, international organizations, and foreign governments or agencies thereof, to pay a fair and proportionate share of the costs of international programs designed to provide volunteers to meet the trained manpower needs of less developed countries. What is envisaged here by the committee is encouraging creation of voluntary service programs in the pattern of international consortiums that have been successful in development lending.

While there is no direct reference in the proposed language to the International Secretariat for Volunteer Services, the committee does consider it to be a possible vehicle for the type of effort the committee has in mind. At the present time the U.S. contribution has been the provision of personnel (two or three professionals) and the International Secretariat activities have been largely confined to those of a clearinghouse. There appears to be no reason, however, that the organization could not take a more vigorous part in operations—developing joint schemes and putting together teams of volunteers to carry them out.

The committee does want to make clear, however, that the language recommended to the Senate allows the Peace Corps flexibility in deciding where and how to utilize its resources for this purpose.

In this connection, the committee takes note of the device suggested to it of establishing an international register of available volunteers from which countries seeking volunteers could fashion their own teams. It hopes that serious consideration will be given to the feasibility of such a register as a means of encouraging joint projects.

In summary, the committee urges the Peace Corps to seek and develop opportunities both at the country level and at the international conference table to involve itself in multinational volunteer efforts.

OTHER MATTERS CONSIDERED BY THE COMMITTEE

Waiver of claims.—Section 2 of the bill amends the Peace Corps Act so as to make volunteers employees of the Federal Government for the purpose of section 5584 of title 5, United States Code. Peace Corps volunteers and volunteer leaders are already deemed to be employees of the Government for various purposes, such as the Federal Employees Compensation Act, the Federal Tort Claim Act, and the Federal Voting Assistance Act. 5 U.S.C. 5584 provides that the Comptroller General or the head of an agency may waive claims up to $500, against employees who have been overpaid, if there exists no indication of fraud, misrepresentation, fault, or lack of good faith on the part of the employee. Readjustment allowances of volunteers and volunteer leaders will be considered pay for the purposes of the section.

The Peace Corps, during calendar year 1968, processed approximately 200 claims of this nature, involving a total of about $16,000, or an average claim of $80. Not all of these claims will meet the standards prescribed by the Comptroller General for waiver, so the total amount of claims involved will be less than this figure.

Use of excess local currencies.—The committee discussed with the Peace Corps a report by the Comptroller General, April 23, 1969, concerning the opportunity to use excess foreign currencies to pay transportation expenses of returning Peace Corps volunteers. It is gratified to report that the Peace Corps will meet the criticism of the General Accounting Office as set forth in the following statement furnished for the record:

"PEACE CORPS STATEMENT ON CASH-IN-LIEU POLICY

"Although the reasons, as explained in Mr. Vaughn's letter of September 3, 1968, to Mr. Stovall of the General Accounting Office (copy attached) * for the adoption and retention of the cash-in-lieu policy are persuasive, the Peace Corps has concluded that the countervailing considerations cited by the Comptroller General are, at this time, paramount. Therefore, all new volunteer applicants will be advised prior to their enrollment as volunteers that the cash-in-lieu-of-GTR privilege will not be available if, at the times of the termination of their Peace Corps service, they are stationed in a country which has been designated by the Treasury Department as an 'excess' or 'near-excess' currency country. This new policy should meet the thrust of the objections raised by the Comptroller General.

Those volunteers presently in service were advised of the cash-in-lieu privilege at the time of their enrollment and have, to some extent, relied upon it. It is reasonable to assume that volunteers plan their return travel about 6 months in advance of their termination. These travel plans include, in many cases, surface travel in third countries which will require dollars. Accordingly, we plan to apply the former policy to all volunteers terminating prior to January 1, 1970. Volunteers presently serving in 'excess or near-excess currency countries,' but terminating after December 31, 1969, will be given GTR's payable in excess currency."

Research.—The committee continues to be somewhat concerned about the Peace Corps' research activities and stresses again its desire that this activity be confined to the subjects directly related to the Peace Corps. While the committee recognizes that the $500,000 ceiling on research placed on fiscal year 1967 funds no longer applies, it expects the Peace Corps to keep its obligations for this category below that amount, as it has done voluntarily since that time.

Security investigations.—For the second year in a row the high cost of security investigations came under committee scrutiny. At $450 per trainee the estimated cost of this item to the Peace Corps for fiscal year 1970 will be close to $4 million. The Peace Corps Director has assured the committee that an overdue study of this expense will be undertaken. It expects to examine this question again next year.

COMMITTEE ACTION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The amended administration request was introduced as S. 2041 on May 1, 1969. Public hearings were held on June 3 and 25, 1969, at which the principal witness was Joseph H. Blatchford, the Director of the Peace Corps. The committee considered the bill in executive session on July 2, 29, and August 7. On September 8, the House passed H.R. 11039 by a vote of 281 to 52 and on September 10 the committee ordered H.R. 11039 favorably reported with amendments.

As proposed to be amended by the committee, the authorities contained in H.R. 11039 will enable the Peace Corps to continue its programs on a scale commensurate with U.S. capabilities and priorities, as well as to explore on a pilot basis other avenues by which to increase the effectiveness of its role abroad. The committee urges the Senate to pass H.R. 11039 subject to the recommended amendments.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD and by unanimous consent, the amendments were agreed to en bloc.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments to H.R. 11039 and request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. GORE, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. MUNDT conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which H.R. 11039 was passed this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed will be entered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

*Omitted.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The bill clerk read the nomination of A. Sydney Herlong, of Florida, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia subsequently said: Mr. President, the Senate has confirmed today the appointment of an outstanding American as a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission. I commend the appointment of the Honorable A. Sydney Herlong, of Florida, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Mr. Herlong served for many years as a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Florida. He distinguish himself as a member of the Ways and Means Committee. He is a man of abiltiy and of the highest integrity. He retired from the Congress of his own volition. I am happy that he is now back in the Government.

I commend President Nixon on his appointment of former Congressman Herlong, Democrat, of Florida.

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The bill clerk read the nomination of William H. Quealy, of Virginia, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

CALIFORNIANS KILLED IN VIETNAM

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, on April 20, 1961, the first California youth was killed in action in the Vietnam war. He was 27-year-old Sp4 Theodore Glen Feland, of Sonoma.

By last Friday, September 12, 1969, the total number of California deaths in Vietnam had risen to 3,782.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all their names and hometowns be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

LIST OF CASUALTIES INCURRED BY U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL IN CONNECTION WITH THE CONFLICT IN VIETNAM BY HOME STATE OF RECORD

JANUARY 1, 1961–DECEMBER 31, 1968

California

Army

Ables, Elmer Robert Lee, Jr., Newhall.
Achica, Eddie, San Francisco.
Adams, James Edward, Pacoima.
Adams, Kenneth Stanley, Santa Barbara.
Aguilar, Rudolph Rene, Los Angeles.
Albertini, Joseph Alfred, La Puente.
Allen, Terry James, Indio.
Almanza, John Jerald, Santa Ana.
Altieri, Allan Joseph, Glendale.
Alvarado, Alfred Frederick, Long Beach.
Alvarez, George Calderon, Monterey Park.
Amato, Richard C., Hayward.
Anderson, Clinton Russell, Healdsburg.
Anderson, Robert Douglas, Carmichael.
Andrews, Ronald L., Pico Rivera.
Andrews, Vaun, San Fernando.
Annos, George Richard, Caliexico.
Anthony, Lionel S., Los Angeles.
Apodaca, Peter Michael, San Bruno.
Applegate, Kenneth Charles, Ventura.
Arent, Kenneth Jacob, Sacramento.
Armendarez, Mike, Huntington Beach.
Arraiz, James Paul, North Hollywood.
Arrey, Frank, Jr., Norwalk.
Aubert, Thomas Clifford, Los Angeles.
Austin, Robert, Modesto.
Aylor, Charles Vincent, San Bernardino.
Azbill, Roy Gordon, Weaverville.
Baglio, Richard Anthony, Lomita.
Baird, Robert Stanley, Orinda.
Baker, Alton Eugene, Salinas.
Baker, Barry Jay, Oakland.
Baker, Stanley Wellington, Los Angeles.
Balbirnie, James Frederick, Stockton.
Barber, Melvin, Compton.
Barber, Roger Lee, Sun Valley.
Barker, Gary Lee, Garden Grove.
Barkfelt, David William, North Hollywood.
Barleen, Thomas Lyle, Vallejo.
Barrera, Manuel, Hanford.
Barreras, Frank, III, Pico Rivera.
Barrett, Charles Wesley, San Francisco.
Bartalotti, Alfonso Paul, Vallejo.
Barton, Harold Bruce, Campbell.
Batty, Denny Albert, Campbell.
Bauer, James Neil, San Diego.
Baum, Douglas Bruce, La Mesa.
Baum, Michael Lee, Riverside.
Bayles, Gerald William, Indio.
Bays, Lee R., Olivehurst.
Bazell, Frank David, Los Angeles.
Bell, Richard Leslie Allen, San Jose.
Belveal, James Allen, Sacramento.
Benadum, Richard Dennis, Los Angeles.
Bennett, Clifton E., El Monte.
Benson, Keith Lloyd, Santa Clara.
Bentley, Boris Roman Benja, San Francisco.
Berard, James Eugene, Saratoga.
Bermudez, Jesus Rojas, Mendota.
Bernal, Raymond, Jr., San Jose.
Betancourt, Gabriel, Hollister.
Betchel, David Brooks, Los Angeles.
Billhimer, Gary Arthur, Sante Fe Springs.
Bishop, Daniel Edward, Newcastle.
Bishop, Richard Lavern, Covina.
Blackburn, Elbert Frank, Norwalk.
Blessman, William David, Sebastopol.
Boelzner, Robert Craig, Hawthorne.
Boettcher, Walter R., Jr., Concord.
Bohler, Robert Ronald, Downey.
Borja, Domingo R. S., San Francisco.
Bowman, Paul Jr., Kensington.
Boyer, Donald William, Riverside.
Bozarth, Alvin Ray, Lamont.
Brady, Thomas Gerald, Fremont.
Brady, Thomas Paul, Bakersfield.
Brancato, Michael George, Los Angeles.
Breda, Dennis John, Oxnard.
Breshears, Kenneth Lester, Riverbank.
Breshears, Ronald Chris, Martinez.
Britten, Lawrence Alan, Fair Oaks.
Broadbeck, John Gilbert, Sacramento.
Brockington, Curtis, Harbor City.
Brotzman, Michael Ray, Richmond.
Brown, George Michael, Los Angeles.
Brown, Michael Gregory, El Segundo.
Brown, Michael R., Fresno.
Brown, Richard Tyrone, Hayward.
Bruce, Dennis Ray, San Luis Obispo.
Brumley, Bob Gene, Chowchilla.
Brunat, Michael F., Los Angeles.
Bullington, James Allen, Santa Rosa.
Bumgarner, Bruce Howard, Vallejo.
Burkey, Kermit Edward, San Jose.
Burlingame, Stephen Frank, Glendale.
Burnett, Joseph Darryl, Trona.
Bushay, Byron Haley, Fullerton.
Butts, Jerry Eugene, Long Beach.
Byam, Michael Leroy, El Centro.
Byers, Kenneth Edward, San Leandro.
Cagnacci, Joseph Mario, Pleasanton.
Caguimbal, Pepito, Castroville.
Callen, Richard James, Los Angeles.
Calph, Gene Elwood, Eureka.
Calvillo, Robert Jess, Bakersfield.
Camero, Santos, Malaga.
Campbell, Carlin Martin, Jr., San Diego.
Campbell, Thomas Edwards, Arcadia.
Campo, Robert E., San Francisco.
Campos, Richard Frederick, San Francisco.
Caramella, Paul Doane, Long Beach.
Card, Wayne Norman, Whittier.
Carey, John, Jr., Santa Barbara.
Carley, Raymond Montell, Los Angeles.
Carnevale, David James, Woodside.
Carrola, Edward, Sacramento.
Carter, Thomas James, Sacramento.
Carver, Richard Alan, Escondido.
Casselman, Rodney Willard, Arcadia.
Castaneda, Benjamin Beltra, El Monte.
Castro, Jesse Romero, Fremont.
Caudillo, Joseph, Kerman.
Cavarzan, Duane Earl, Weed.
Cecil, Jack Wilson, National City.
Centeno, Charles Manuel, Gilroy.
Chabot, Don William, Oakland.
Chacon, Rigoberto Coto, El Monte.
Chase, Mark Richardson, Santa Monica.
Chavez, Eduardo, Santa Paula.
Chavez, Rudolfo, Santa Ana.
Cheroff, Michael, Downey.
Cherrstrom, Ronald Paul, Belmont.
Cherry, Willam Temen, Jr., Anaheim.
Chislock, Leonard James, Lakewood.
Cisneros, Mario Alvarez, Riverbank.
Claeys, Edward Oran, Fremont.
Clark, Gary Richard, San Francisco.
Clark, Paul Leslie, Lynwood.
Clark, Thorne M., III, Lompoc.
Clausen, Harland Gene, Jr., Venice.
Clendenen, Charles Curtis, Cypress.
Cleveland, James, Los Angeles.
Close, Donald Edward, Burbank.
Cloud, Joseph, Jr., Pleasanton.
Cochran, Michael Dale, Lancaster.
Coffey, Richard Arthur, Los Angeles.
Coleman, Gary Terrence, Alameda.
Collins, Richard Glen, Altadena.
Combs, Alfred Henry, Jr., Seaside.
Combs, Allan Eugene, Los Angeles.
Conley, Terry Lewis, Sacramento.
Conrad, Roy Eugene, Goshen.
Constantini, Frank J., Jr., Sepulveda.
Cook, Austin Bruce, Alameda.
Cook, George Kenneth, Fortuna.
Cook, William Donald, Jr., San Jose.
Cornejo, Alfred Joseph, San Mateo.
Cornell, Edward Michael, North Hollywood.
Corona, Rudolph Ralph, III, Pacific Grove.
Coryell, Michael Noble, Santa Barbara.
Cossa, William Edward, Jr., Inglewood.
Coulson, Thomas Eugene, Orosi.
Crain, Charles Ernest, Redwood City.
Crawford, Claude Lee, Los Angeles.
Cripe, Merl L., Orland.
Cross, Hugh W., North Hollywood.
Cross, Monroe Ward, Colusa.
Cryar, Michael George, El Monte.
Cullen, Dennis John, Anaheim.
Cummings, Donald Louis, Jr., Glendora.
Cummings, James Barton, Jr., Long Beach.
Cuneo, Andrea Jr., Sunnyvale.
Cunningham, David Carson, Fall River Mills.
Curtis, Richard, Walnut Creek.
D Aiello, Michael Dennis, Pasadena.
Dailey, Kevin Melbourne, San Diego.
Daily, Thomas Blake, Hawthorne.
Daniels, Thomas James, Sacramento.
Danna, Samuel Don, Temple City.
Danser, Gary Richard, Fontana.
Daugherty, Donald D., San Diego.
Davis, Alfred Lee, Long Beach.
Day, Peter Evan, Modesto.
De Amaral, Charles Francis, Carmel.
De La Torre, Luis, Los Angeles.
Deaver, Jack, San Diego.

Deherrera, Raymond F., Los Angeles.
Dekker, George William, San Mateo.
Dellamandola, Gregory John, Stockton.
Denman, William Luther, Maxwell.
Dennis, Blair Edward, Sacramento.
Dickson, William Douglas, Oxnard.
Dietz, Lawrence Alfred, II, Palos Verdes.
Dillon, David Andrew, Spring Valley.
Doane, George Alfred, San Rafael.
Dodd, Lawrence Rudin, Aromas.
Dodson, David Lee, Oakland.
Dominguez, Ernesto, Bakersfield.
Dorsey, Carlito Ladores, Seaside.
Douglas, Charles Mac, Bloomington.
Drake, Earle Avon, Mill Valley.
Duck, Curtis Lamar, National City.
Dueman, Merle L., Inglewood.
Duffy, Francis Joseph, Los Angeles.
Duncan, James Robert, Fremont.
Dungey, Rim Michael, San Diego.
Dunn, Creighton Robert, Ventura.
Dunn, Gregory Lynn, Santa Rosa.
Durbin, Thomas Frederick, Escondido.
Durham, Samuel Ray, Lomita.
Dye, Danny David, Visalia.
Edwards, John Leonard, San Diego.
Elias, Porfirio Elias, Colton.
Ellis, Michael Le Roy, Valinda.
Enari, Mark Niggol, Pasadena.
Enderiz, Victor Anthony, Vallejo.
Engherson, Robert Lewis, San Leandro.
Enriquez, Terry Michael, Burbank.
Epley, Roger Lee, Lancaster.
Erickson, Donald Theodore, Fresno.
Erschoen, Arthur Raymond, Los Angeles.
Ervin, James Wilbur, Gilroy.
Escobar, Edward Angiano, Coachella.
Estes, Dennis Rex, Garden Grove.
Evans, Chris Steven, Paramount.
Evans, Donald Ward, Jr., Covina.
Ewing, Timothy David, Exeter.
Eynon, John Patrick, Yuba City.
Fackrell, Clinton Blair, Willits.
Fannin, Clayton Allen, Bakersfield.
Farley, Marshall Colin, Folsom.
Faulks, Daniel Clyde, Jr., Eureka.
Ferguson, Blaine M., Los Angeles.
Ferguson, Edward Kenneth, San Lorenzo.
Ferguson, Merl Wayne, Yuba City.
Ferguson, Ronald Dennis, San Francisco.
Fergusson, Robert Charles, Monterey.
Fernandez, Earl William, Westminister.
Fernandez, Xavier, Los Angeles.
Ferro, Philip Anthony, Northridge.
Ferrulla, Robert Samuel, Lynwood.
Fidel, Honorio Moran, Jr., Stockton.
Files, Albert Clifton, Jr., Sacramento.
Fischer, Gregory James, San Bernadino.
Fisher, Jimmy Lee, Calistoga.
Fitzgerald, Terence Patric, San Francisco.
Flannery, Michael Edward, Willows.
Flansaas, Daniel Robert, Loomis.
Flickinger, James Herbert, Burbank.
Florez, Reynaldo B., Visalia.
Flower, Carl David, Rio Linda.
Force, David Lee, San Bernardino.
Foster, Robert Lee, Sacramento.
Fowler, Daniel Charles, Citrus Heights.
Fowler, William Holt, III, San Jose.
Frakes, Kenneth Dean, Lancaster.
Francis, Stephen David, Burbank.
Frankel, John Paul, Santa Clara.
Franklin, George Steve, San Pablo.
Franklin, Jammie Van, Merced.
Freiling, John Richard, Jr., Sunnyvale.
Frenzell, Herbert Ernest, Sacramento.
Frick, John Alan, Anaheim.
Frits, Orville Bill, Concord.
Fry, Billy G., Bakersfield.
Frye, Terrance Donald, San Bernardino.
Gabbert, Dennis Erwin, Eureka.
Gaines, Melvin Clyde, Los Angeles.
Garcia, Gregorio M., Los Angeles.
Garcia, Melesso, Watsonville.
Garcia, Raymond, Jr., San Diego.
Garcia, Richard, Ft Ord.
Garcia, William, Pacoima.
Gardner, Jack Elroy, Vacaville.
Garibay, Guadalupe B. L., San Diego.
Garton, Tommy Ray, Vallejo.
Gasser, Donald Leroy, Berkeley.
Gatti, Gary Francis, Lynwood.
Gaul, Bill Edger, Newberry Springs.
Gaymon, Stephen H., Corcoran.
Gellerman, Kenneth Gilbert, San Jose.
George, Richard Eugene, San Diego.
Gerhardt, Ernest Kay, Modesto.
Gershen, Howard Dexter, Pacoima.
Giannelli, Giuseppe, Oakland.
Gibson, Walter Lewis, Oakland.
Gilbert, Thomas Orval, Stockton.
Gilber'son, Verland Ansel, Banning.
Gilliam, Robert Wendell, Lompoc.
Giovanacci, Richard Allen, Santa Maria.
Goar, Larry L., Snelling.
Goias, Everett William, San Francisco.
Gomez, Henry, Riverside.
Gomez, Robert, Los Angeles.
Gomez, Robert Razo, Los Angeles.
Gonzales, Merced Herman, Woodlake.
Good, Kenneth Newlon, San Marino.
Goodman, Greg Fredric, San Clemente.
Goodwin, Robbin Adair, Riverside.
Gosse, Jose C., San Francisco.
Graham, Albert, Jr., Bakersfield.
Graham, John Harry, San Mateo.
Graney, Donald Caryl, Santa Barbara.
Gray, Leonard Clarence, Jr., Los Angeles.
Green, Bernard Alan, Los Angeles.
Green, Billy Monroe, Los Angeles.
Green, Roy Colyn, Long Beach.
Greene, Edward Leonard, Marysville.
Gregory, Mack Edward, Gardena.
Grey, James William, Los Angeles.
Grothe, Lewis Daniel, Lakeport.
Grove, Norman Doyal, Fall River Mills.
Grundy, Dallas George, San Jose.
Guerra, Jerry Eugene, Pasadena.
Guglielmoni, Timothy P., Hermosa Beach.
Guillory, James Clifton, Los Angeles.
Gupton, Richard Charles, Compton.
Hadley, Jerome Cecil, Brooks.
Hagen, Craig Louis, Sacramento.
Hahn, Gary Gorden, San Gabriel.
Hambrick, Harold Michael, Los Angeles.
Hamilton, Earlie C., Jr., Long Beach.
Hammar, James Leroy, La Mirada.
Hammond, Kenneth Joe, San Diego.
Hampton, Henry Garfield, Van Nuys.
Hanger, Jack Dennis, Cypress.
Hannigan, John Edward, III, Antioch.
Hanson, Kenneth Gregory, Los Angeles.
Haraldson, David Alan, Long Beach.
Harding, Terry Alan, Vallejo.
Harnden, Jim Lawrence, Long Beach
Harper, Monte Ray, Palmdale.
Harris, Jack M., El Cajon.
Harris, Jack Marston, Roseville.
Harrison, Paul James, Lakewood
Hartman, John William, Long Beach.
Hartman, Nicholas Mark, Sun Valley.
Hartnell, Richard Miguel, Whittier.
Harvey, Michael Gail, Redwood City.
Hasuike, Skyler Lance, Los Angeles.
Hauser, Vincent Vanalstyne, San Diego.
Hawk, Jeffrey Allen, Capistrano Beach.
Hawkins, Arthur Loren, Jr., Reseda.
Hawkins, Don Albert, San Diego.
Hayden, John Loren, Los Angeles.
Hayes, David Anthony, Bell Gardens.
Heal, Michael Joseph, Hayward.
Heaston, Donald Leroy, Santa Ana.
Hendricks, Terry Alan, San Bernardino.
Henry, William Richard, Sunnyvale.
Herderick, Christopher Erv, Buena Park.
Hernandez, Clemente Daniel, San Bernardino.
Hernandez, Demetrio Lomeli, Patterson.
Hernandez, Reynaldo Castil, Tulare.
Herrell, Daniel Bruce, Anaheim.
Herrick, Henry Toro, Laguna Beach.
Heill, John Robert, Van Nuys.
Hill, Maurice Richard, Los Angeles.
Hill, Rodney Dean, Tahoe City.
Hiltson, Frederick Alton, Exeter.
Hoffman, Frederick Jean, Sacramento.
Holcomb, Daniel Jennings, Buena Park.
Holguin, Frank John, Los Angeles.
Hollis, James Shelton, Sacramento.
Holmes, Jerry Leonard, Modesto.
Holovits, Laszlo, Seaside.
Holstein, John L., San Bruno.
Honrath, Jon Roy, Garden Grove.
Horton, Albert Hugh, Oakland.
Hotchkiss, Michael Jenning, Anaheim.
Houghton, James Curtis, Downey.
Houser, Jerry Lee, Sacramento.
Howell, Michael Wayne, Rodeo.
Hobbard, Gregory George, Sherman Oaks.
Hughes, Edward Cowart III, Garden Grove.
Huicochea-Reyna Ignacio, Compton.
Hume, Carl Michael, Fresno.
Hunt, Martin Mosher, Menlo Park.
Hunnicelli, Richard Lee, Castro Valley.
Ingalls, George Alan, Norco.
Irving, John William Jr., San Jose.
Irwin, Richard Ray Jr., Arcadia.
Ires, David Allen, Fairfield.
Jackson, Arthur James, Los Angeles.
Jackson, James Albert, Seaside.
Jackson, Otis E., Los Angeles.
Jacobs, Joseph Lewis, Northridge.
Jacobsen, Wallace Ray, Oakland.
Jagfield, Allen Dale, San Gabriel.
James, Joe Neal, Oakland.
Jamison, Rockwell Grant, Los Angeles.
Jaramillo, Jorge M., Los Angeles.
Jeter, Danny Wayne, Riverside.
Jett, William Howard, Los Angeles.
Johnson, David Joseph, Los Angeles.
Johnson, Douglas Ray, Burbank.
Johnson, Leonard Richard, Oakland.
Johnson, Philip Harry, Redondo Beach.
Johnson, Ray Eldriege, Oakland.
Johnson, Robert Allen, Novato.
Johnson, Ronald Joe, Santa Cruz.
Johnson, Timothy Alan, Lancaster.
Johnson, William F., Los Angeles.
Johnston, Jerry Bernis, Wilmington.
Johnston, Richard J., Sacramento.
Jones, George Wallace, Los Angeles.
Jones, Jerry Don, Susanville.
Jones, Tommy, Bakersfield.
Joujon-Roche, Edward, Bakersfield.
Juarez, John, Colton.
Kajiwara, James Toshi, San Francisco.
Kaneko, Julio, Lemon Grove.
Karger, Richard Tildon, Los Angeles.
Katz, Allan Harvey, Santa Monica.
Kazikowski, Jeffrey G., San Diego.
Kead, John K., III, Los Angeles.
Keckler, Robert L., Los Angeles.
Kell, James Stewart, Montebello.
Kelly, Charles Patrick, Fullerton.
Kennedy, William Edward, Los Angeles.
Kenney, Elmer Frederick, Canoga Park.
Keppler, John M., Gardena.
Kiehl, Michael Raymond, El Cajon.
Kiley, Michael James, Long Beach.
King, Charles Michael, Jr., Sylmar.
Kistner, Guy Dale, Burlingame.
Kitner, Richard Granville, Los Angeles.
Klausing, Ronald Lavern, San Diego.
Klug, Richard Duane, Glendale.
Koeppe, Walter, Jr., San Jose.
Kofler, Siegfried, Ventura.
Kovacs, Zoltan Alajos, Berkeley.
Kozel, Patrick Charles, Los Angeles.
Krotzer, Donald Morgan, Wilmington.
La Barber, James J., Lodi.
Lake, Larry Vernon, Inglewood.
Lamarr, Phillips, Compton.
Lanelli, Jack Daniel, Napa.
Lapp, Melvin Charles, Sacramento.
Lara, Chevo Garcia, North Sacramento.
Larson, Peter Swinnerton, San Francisco.
Lau, Cornelius Afai Laulii, Los Angeles.
Lawson, Donald Victor, Jr. Bakersfield.
Lawson, William E., Merced.
Leal, Frank Daniel, Corona.
Leal, John Borges, San Bernardino.
Ledesma, Joseph, Jr., San Jose.
Lee, James George, Paso Robles.
Lee, John Patrick, La Crescenta.
Legler, Steven Edward, Woodland Hills.
Lewis, Rodger Dale, Los Angeles.
Leyva-Parra-Frias, Fernand, Norwalk.
Lider, Fred Rodriguez, Oakland.
Linn, David William, Anaheim.
Locatelli, Vincent, Santa Cruz.
Lockhart, Roy, Vallejo.
Logan, Halford, Los Angeles.
Lohman, Robert Thomas, Woodland Hills.

Loisel, Patrick Michael, Chatsworth.
Lona, Gabriel, Los Angeles.
Looney, Jerry Wayne, Hanford.
Lopez, Lupe Paul, Sacramento.
Lopez, Max Andy, Anaheim.
Lopez, Raymond, Los Angeles.
Lopez, Steve, Fremont.
Lovato, Lauriano Lawrence, Oakland.
Lowe, Clayton Bentley, Jr., Palmdale.
Lowery, Michael Ayr, San Francisco.
Lucos, Myron Donald, Bakersfield.
Ludwig, Leonard R., Oxnard.
Luhnow, Glenn Eugene, El Cajon.
Luna, Henry Thomas, Fresno.
Lusk, Donnie Ray, Kettleman City.
Lussier, Larry Paul, Gustine.
Lyle, Terrance Richard, LaPuente.
Machado, Gary Allaen, Oakland.
Mack, Robert Lee, San Francisco.
Macklin, Ronald Wayne, Glendale.
Maguire, Robert Stanley, Atascadero.
Marek, Joseph Penn, Fontana.
Marin, Julian, Corcoran.
Marion, Harry Lewis, Los Gatos.
Marshall, Richard Allan, Glen Avon.
Marshall, Roger Robert, Lakewood.
Martin, David Lee, Jr., Gustine.
Martin, Jimmie Carter, Gardena.
Martin, Joseph Thomas, San Luis Obispo.
Martin, Larry Joe, Arvin.
Matayoshi, Wallace Kenji, Torrance.
Matthews, James Newton, Milpitas.
Mauldin, Michael B., Fresno.
Maxwell, Robert James, Fresno.
Maynard, Thomas Harry, El monte.
McAlister, Donald Lynn, Inglewood.
McBride, Fitz-Randolph, Bu, Portugese Bend.
McBroom, Lloyd Lindal, Costa Mesa.
McClelland, Myron, Downieville.
McClure, Jack Dale, Modesto.
McCommons, Michael Ray, Anaheim.
McCoy, John Lowery, Los Angeles.
McCullough, Michael Eugen, Concord.
McDaniel, Craig Allan, Lake Arrowhead.
McDonald, James Howard, Carpinteria.
McDowell, William Joseph, El Monte.
McElyea, James Frank, Escondido.
McGriff, Danny Jay, Fresno.
McKenzie, James Allen, Hayward.
McKinney, Ronald Eugene, Los Angeles.
McLaughlin, James Paul, Sacramento.
McLaughlin, William Lawre, San Bernardino.
McLedd, Robert Lee, Inglewood.
McMahon, John Thomas, Long Beach.
McMaster, John William, IV, Merced.
McMasters, Charles Anthon, Los Angeles.
McMinn, Danny Lee, Hermosa Beach.
McNally, Harry Merle, Hayward.
McNeilly, Ronald William, Alhambra.
McRoberts, Clifford Wayne, Whittier.
Mears, Charles Robert, Patterson.
Meek, Joe Lanell, Exeter.
Melendez, Rudolph, San Jose.
Melendres, Joseph Thomas, Concord.
Menane, Jerry Bruce, Santa Barbara.
Messer, Jon Laird, Downey.
Meyer, Gary Paul, Pleasanton.
Meyer, Otto Paul, III, Palm Desert.
Michael, Lloyd Donald, Round Mountain.
Middlekauff, David, El Cerrito.
Miller, Gary Dean, South Gate.
Miller, Jerry Robert, Baldwin Park.
Miller, Jimmy Allen, Los Angeles.
Miller, Louis Charles, Watsonville.
Miller, Michael Clifton, Norwalk.
Miller, Oren Kenneth, Oxnard.
Milovich, Robin Patrick, Yreka.
Miramontes, Arthur Fred, Woodland.
Mitchell, Michael Sidney, Richmond.
Mitchell, Roger C., Delano.
Moldenhauer, Russell, Oxnard.
Molina, George Geronimo, Los Angeles.
Molina, Michael Joseph, Los Angeles.
Monahan, Michael James, San Francisco.
Monterroso, Alfonso Alfred, Los Angeles.
Montes, Raul, Los Angeles.
Moore, Charles Sargeant, Sacramento.
Moore, Dennis Eugene, Riverside.
Moore, Galen Leroy, Newport Beach.
Morales, Tommy, Los Angeles.
Moran, Alberto Hector, Los Angeles.
Moran, Ray Edward, Jr., Big Bear Lake.
Moreno, Martin Walter, Newark.
Moreno, Robert, Los Angeles.
Morgan, Glendell, Los Angeles.
Morgan, Stephen Edward, Saratoga.
Moritz, Michael Perry, Ventura.
Hummert, Robert Sterling, Rialto.
Munden, Donald Martin, Quail Valley.
Mundz, Jesus Arthur, Port Hueneme.
Murphy, Timothy Xavier, Sacramento.
Murphy, Walter Edward, Jr., Covina.
Murray, Douglas Earl, Pomona.
Myers, Charles Lee, Chula Vista.
Myers, Edward George, Los Angeles.
Nadal, Baldomero Arturo, Delano.
Nagengast, Carl Delane, Long Beach.
Nance, David Eugene, Marysville.
Nasser, Robert Benjamin, Los Angeles.
Nathan, John Arthur, San Francisco.
Nelson, Allan Joseph, Jr., Novato.
New, George, Jr., Fresno.
Newberry, Jasper Newton, Jr., Lewiston.
Noe, Tim A., Redlands.
Noelke, Richard Allen, Fontana.
Nootz, Gaylord Eugene, Rialto.
Norman, Clae Terry, San Leandro.
Northern, James Robert All, Fullerton.
Norwood, Richard Dale, Orange Grove.
Noyola, Richard, Los Angeles.
Nuesse, Chester Keith, Frembnt.
Nunez, Fred Contreras, Tulare.
Nunez, Rudolph Algar, Wilmington.
O'Connor, Denis, San Francisco.
Ochoa, Louie, Hanford.
Oglethorpe, Thomas Jay, Petaluma.
Oland, David Michael, Whittier.
Olmos, Luis, Pacoima.
Onana, Ralph Wheeler, Los Angeles.
Ontiveros, Thomas J., Santa Maria.
Orosco, Larry J., Corona.
Osborne, Richard Gene, Hanford.
Oshiro, Warren Shigeo, Los Angeles.
Ostroff, Steven Larry, Sun Valley.
Osuna, Antonio Richard. San Diego.
Otsen, David Bryan, San Bernardino.
Owens, Billy Ray, Moss Beach.
Padilla, Robert Louis, Ventura.
Paiz, Jerry, Norwalk.
Palacios, Casimiro, Los Angeles.
Palenske, William Allen, San Jose.
Palmer, Ronny Leroy, Azusa.
Papalas, Anthony Steven, Hermosa Beach.
Parham, Richard Lynn, Modesto.
Paris, Crawford Brian, Los Angeles.
Parkel, Gerald Phillip, North Hollywood.
Parker, Bennie Frank, Bakersfield.
Parks, Stephen Earl, Los Angeles.
Parnella, John, San Francisco.
Patrick, Richard Michael, San Jose.
Patterson, Dwayne Maxifiel, Calipatria.
Patterson, Ronald Oren, Northridge.
Patton, John Perry, Oakland.
Pelham, Lester Leon, Westminster.
Penman, Ronald Stirling, Los Angeles.
Penn, Ronald W., Cucamonga.
Perez, Guadalupe, San Joaquin.
Petersen, Raymond Allan, San Jose.
Petersen, William Robert, Garden Grove.
Peterson, Donald Martin, Santa Maria.
Peterson, Michael Eugene, Monrovia.
Peterson, Richard W., West Covina.
Pettit, Denzil Dee, Bloomington.
Petty, Eugene, Farmersville.
Phelps, Ronnie Louis, Porterville.
Philbin, Richard Griffith, Sacramento.
Phillips, Anthony Bruce, Los Angeles.
Phillips, Pat Ellis, Sylmar.
Pierce, Larry Stanley, Taft.
Pinchot, Craig D., Lakewood.
Pink, Joseph Patrick, San Jacinto.
Piper, James Dennis, San Lorenzo.
Pipkin, Frank Meadows, Blythe.
Pitt, Robert Louis, Culver City.
Pitt, Roy Sharp, Menlo Park.
Pleasant, Stephen Donald, Burbank.
Plumb, Cary Anthoney, Alameda.
Podgorny, Dennis Richard, Livermore.
Pope, Derek Boyd, Alameda.
Portello, Roderick Charles, Pacoima.
Portugal, Ignacio, Jr., Norwalk.
Powers, Bradley Leland, Kettleman.
Prange, Joseph Wilder, Los Angeles.
Pratt, Richard Chester, San Francisco.
Preddy, Robert Lee, San Bernardino.
Prediger, Franz Gerhard, Long Beach.
Prentice, Dennis Albert, San Pablo.
Prys, Robert William, San Diego.
Pulsifer, Nelson F., Jr., Lakeside.
Purser, James Leavell, Anaheim.
Quintero, Jose Hernandez, Santa Fe Springs.
Raine, David Shelton, San Bernardino.
Ramirez, David Thomas, Sanger.
Ramirez, Juan, Lynwood.
Ramsey, Michael Wayne, Port Chicago.
Randall, Michael Paul, Los Angeles.
Rangel, Richard, San Bernardino.
Rarig, Robin Arthur, North Hollywood.
Raschke, Dean Nelson, Dos Palos.
Rasmussen, Neal Arthur, Modesto.
Reeder, David Lee, Saugus.
Reid, Edward Rowan, Jr., North Hollywood.
Reid, William Albert, North Hollywood.
Reilly, Allan Vincent, Los Angeles.
Renfro, Norman, Oakland.
Reynoso, Rene, Los Angeles.
Rhoads, Danny David, Lemoore.
Rice, Cameron A., Petaluma.
Rice, Ronald Fred, Los Angeles.
Richardson, David Allen, Long Beach.
Ridgway, Clyde Moses, Rosamond.
Rigg, William Cecil, Los Angeles.
Riggins, Gary Ronald, Yreka.
Rivera, Jose A., San Francisco.
Rix, Douglas Alfred, Grass Valley.
Robbins, Charles Lester, Los Angeles.
Roberts, Michael Allen, Los Angeles.
Robin, David Alan, Richmond.
Robinson, Floyd Irwin, San Jose.
Robison, Jim Bruce, Borrego Springs.
Robustellini, David W., Montague.
Rocha, George Xavier, Garden Grove.
Rodarte, Alexander D., Compton.
Rodreick, Ronald Nelson, Fresno.
Rodrigues, Eugenio, Santa Fe Springs.
Rodriguez, Manuel Joe, Oxnard.
Rodriguez, Roger Espinoza, Heber.
Rodriguez, Romiro C., Stockton.
Rodriguez, Rudolph, Lindsay.
Rogoff, James Bill, Kerman.
Romo, Frank Gonzales, Azusa.
Rorick, Kenneth Roy, Wilmington.
Rose, Barnes Warland, Jr., Wilmington.
Rose, David Jon, San Diego.
Rose, Frank James, Jr., Watsonville.
Ruberg, Christopher Eugene, Pacific Palisades.
Rugge, Lloyd Taylor, North Hollywood.
Russ, Lee Henderson, Oakland.
Ryan, Daniel Joseph, Modesto.
Ryse, Roy Louis, Jr., Inglewood.
Rytter, Paul E., Bakersfield.
Sabel, Joel Michael, West Covina.
Sain, Don Rue, Saratoga.
Salzman, Lavern Leo, Montclair.
Sanchez, Jesse, Union City.
Sanchez, Thomas Joseph, Pasadena.
Sander, Michael Dennis, Oakland.
Sanders, Richard Lee, Los Angeles.
Sanderson, Sander Chris, Kings Beach.
Sandoval, Thomas Fredrick, Alhambra.
Sandstrom, Robert Richard, San Francisco.
Sapp, Clark Edward, Littlerock.
Sarsfield, Harry Carl, Oxnard.
Schaeffer, Frederick Willi, San Diego.
Scheidt, William H., Concord.
Schlottman, James Edward, Carmichael.
Schmidt, Rickford Ray, Lawndale.
Schmitz, Richard Albert, Lynwood.
Schoel, Renny Dean, Marysville.
Schrobilgen, Warren H., Jr., Pacoina.
Schubert, Joel Luther, San Francisco.
Schultz, David Alan, Santa Maria.
Schwellenbach, Gary Ralph, Chico.
Scoggins, John Paul, Hollywood.
Scott, O. D., Seaside.
Scott, Thomas Lee, Anaheim.
Self, Irving Albert, Sacramento.
Semler, Stanley Kenton, Stockton.

Semmer, Peter Anthony, Long Beach.
Semore, Bobby Allen, McKinleyville.
Senger, Michael Melvin, Riverside.
Serna, Leopoldo Perea, Baldwyn Park.
Setzer, Paul Ray, Colma.
Seu, Milton J. S., Alameda.
Shannon, Randell Frank, Redding.
Sharp, Larry Douglas, San Lorenzo.
Shelley, Michael Owen, Pico Rivera.
Shelton, Arthur Alexander, Loyalton.
Sherlock, Joseph V., III, Concord.
Shoemaker, Jerome Charles, Newport Beach.
Sievers, Dale Glenn, Jr., Oroville.
Sipes, Richard Earl, Chula Vista.
Skarphol, Robert Wayne, Hayward.
Skipper, Hugh G., Paramount.
Sloan, Leslie Ray, Redlands.
Smead, Carl Roy, Thermal.
Smith, Donald Eugene, El Monte.
Smith, Donald Ray, Inglewood.
Smith, Gary Kenneth, Santa Ana.
Smith, Gilbert Nolan, Durham.
Smith, Marshall R., Lakewood.
Smith, Vennie Lee, Alameda.
Snyder, Preston John, San Carlos.
Soth, Michael Joseph, Ontario.
Soto, Ricardo Hinojosa, Los Angeles.
Soule, Ronald Glen, Los Gatos.
Speak, Eric B., Costa Mesa.
Spinali, David John, San Mateo.
Spittler, Ira James, III, Santa Maria.
Spitzer, Kenneth Lyle, San Jose.
Stacey, Ralph McGuin, Jr., Pinole.
Stalter, John R., Pico Rivera.
Standridge, Jerry Wayne, Tracy.
Starkey, Henry Morgan, Auburn.
Stearns, Michael Forrester, San Francisco.
Stemac, Stephen Joseph, Sacramento.
Stephan, Larry Roy, Glendale.
Sterud, Martin Frederick, Oakley.
Stevens, Edrick Kenneth, Simi.
Stewart, William Wesley, Livermore.
Stirling, John F., Los Angeles.
Stone, Richard Arlan, Palo Alto.
Sturdivant, Jasper Dean, Lake View Terrace.
Sturdy, Alan MacDonald, Redwood City.
Sullivan, Richard Arthur, San Mateo.
Sutherland, Herbert Lee, Los Angeles.
Tactay, Eugene Richard, Jr., San Diego.
Tafao, Fa Asaviliga V., San Diego.
Tauaese, Valentino, El Monte.
Taylor, Paul Clive, San Francisco.
Taylor, Robert Dwight, Santa Monica.
Tesillo, Armando, Los Angeles.
Thomas, James Edward, Jr., Fresno.
Thomas, Jerry T., Los Angeles.
Thomas, Monte Vernon, Altoe.
Thomas, Rufus Alfonzo, Jr., San Bernardino.
Thompson, Robert Jr., Sepulveda.
Thorpe, David Louis, San Andreas.
Tighe, Charles Joseph, Los Angeles.
Tighe, John Roy, Lomita.
Tillinghast, Bradley Olen, Woodland.
Timmons, Edward Hugh, Central Valley.
Tingle, Kenneth Wayne, Mira Loma.
Tiscornia, John Joseph, San Carlos.
Tomasini, Richard E. Jr., San Francisco.
Totty, Delbert Chan, Wasco.
Toy, Gerald Oscar, Los Angeles.
Tramell, Daniel, Bakersfield.
Troelstrup, Thomas Lee, Hemet.
Tschumi, William John, Manhattan Beach.
Tuller, Dennis J., Martinez.
Turner, Eddie D., Porterville.
Valdez, Daniel Viramontes, Antioch.
Valencia, Francisco Macedo, San Diego.
Van Campen, Thomas Charles, Oroville.
Van Duyne, Robert Schuyler, Beverly Hills.
Van Gieson, Robert Lester, Van Nuys.
Van Patten, Robert Andrew, San Carlos.
Vasques, David, San Juan.
Vasques, Selvester Joe, Los Angeles.
Vasquez, Jimmy, Pico Rivera.
Vasquez, Max V., III, Santa Paula.
Vaughan, Donald Charles, Modesto.
Vaughn, John Patrick, Sunnyvale.
Vaught, Craig Stepehn, Redlands.
Verlinden, Craig Alden, El Sobrante.
Vernes, Robert Frank, Anaheim.
Vierra, Joseph, Oakland.
Villa, Armando, Brentwood.
Villalobos, Juan Jesus, Greenfield.
Vinal, Richard Alden, San Carlos.
Vinassa, Michael, Culver City.
Vincent, George, Los Angeles.
Vurlumis, Chris C., Oakland.
Waldron, George Allen, San Jose.
Waldrop, Ronald Terry, Santee.
Walker, Thomas Ray, Los Angeles.
Wallace, Michael D., Huntington Beach.
Walters, Donald Wesley, South Gate.
Walters, William, San Diego.
Wanamaker, Danny Wayne, Los Angeles.
Warrelmann, Klaus, Carmel.
Washburn, Johnny Lee, Azusa.
Watanabe, James Ryoichiro, Oxnard.
Watkins, Martin Lee, San Diego.
Watkins Sherdin Jay, Cottonwood.
Watson, Alfonza, Los Angeles.
Watson, James Edward, Porterville.
Watson, Wilmer, Seaside.
Weatherly, Jackie Don, Sacramento.
Webber, Scott Stillman, Los Angeles.
Weborg, John Charles, Modesto.
Weeder, Richard D., Chula Vista.
Wehr, James LeRoy, Colton.
Welch, Michael Allen, Crockett.
Weller, Robert Allen, II, Mira Loma.
Wells, Richard Kenneth, Canoga Park.
Werner, Odell Jack, Los Angeles.
Westbay, Gaylord Lee, Hanford.
Whaley, James Goodwin, Sacramento.
Whiting, Richard Edward, Pico Rivera.
Whitley, Emmanuel David, Stockton.
Whitten, David Elga, Los Angeles.
Widener, John Edward, Ventura.
Wilder, Arlos Clayton, El Monte.
Willett, Richard James, Citrus Heights.
Williams, Charles James, Oakland.
Williams, Christian Lars, Redondo Beach.
Williams, David George, Sacramento.
Williams, Dennis Craig, Lodi.
Williams, Frederick Joseph, Rescue.
Williams, Johnny, Los Angeles.
Williams, Larry Keith, Torrance.
Williams, Vincent Richard, Alameda.
Willingham, Eldon Wayne, Santa Maria.
Willis, Donald Clyde, Hayward.
Willis, Joel Thomas, Lodi.
Wilson, Daniel L., Lennox.
Wilson, William Jeffrey, Sanger.
Wiltse, James B. ,Jr., Monrovia.
Winkempleck, George Harold, Porterville.
Wolfe, Kenenth Wayne, Calipatria.
Wonnacott, Walter L., Downey.
Wood, William Milton, Jr., Happy Camp.
Woodall, George Wally, Los Angeles.
Woodruff, Edward Warren, Napa.
Woods, Alonzo Dale, Visalia.
Woods, Charles Gordon, Corona.
Woodson, Johnny, Los Angeles.
Woolley, Mac Lee, Jr., Placentia.
Wright, James L., Novato.
Wright, Jay L., Long Beach.
Wright, Tyrone, Compton.
Wyatt, Alvie Clinton, Walnut Grove.
Yates, Bruce Edgar, Alameda.
Ybanez, Jose, Richmond.
Yeakley, James D., Los Angeles.
Young, Michael Robert, Newport Beach.
Zimmerman, Raymond L., Compton.
Zoeller, Lee Benjamin, Lakewood.
Zoller, Eric Ward, Rambla Vista.
Zuniga, Efrain, Jr., San Francisco.
Zuniga, Vicente, Fresno.

Air Force

Adams, Lee Aaron, Willits.
Anderson, Warren Lester, San Jose.
Bedal, Arthur Eugene, Tarzana.
Buckley, Francis Richard, Los Angeles.
Butterfield, Douglas Holma, Vista.
Callanan, Richard, Joseph, Concord.
Campaigne, Jerry Alan, Central Valley.
Cruz, Raphael, Stockton.
Dixon, Lee Chris, Orland.
Eason, Edwin Raymond, Blythe.
Elkins, Jerome, Los Angeles.
Ellis, James Alvin, Campbell.
Goss, Richard Dean, Los Angeles.
Greco, Lee Attilio, Gilroy.
Green, Donald George, Baldwin Park.
Guerin, John Peter, Los Angeles.
Halvorson, Ernest Joseph, Montclair.
Hendrickson, Alan Eugene, Arcata.
Hudson, Leonard Paul, Sacramento.
Jewitt, Bob, Bell Gardens.
Kelley, Dana Richard, San Carlos.
Knudsen, Harold Eugene, Jr., Paradise.
Krouse, James Charles, North Highlands.
Le Tourneau, Jack Date, Hughson.
Lindberg, David Carl, Lakeport.
Mattis, William Carroll, Acampo.
McAllister, William Walte, Hawthorne.
McPherson, Fred Lamar, Oakland.
Phillips, Theodore Bert, Riverside.
Ruonavaara, Robert Edwin, Healdsburg.
Secanti, Richard Michael, Santa Monica.
Simon, Paul Joseph, Anderson.
Thornell, Edmund Francis, Redondo Beach.
Weger, John Jr., San Fernando.
Whitesides, Richard Lebrou, Stockton.
Winters, Darryl Gordon, San Francisco.

Marine Corps

Abina, Robert Thomas, San Leandro.
Abner, Carl Edward, Campbell.
Acevedo, Richard Joseph, Los Angeles.
Ackley, Gerald Levie, Dunnigan.
Acosta, Daniel, Stockton.
Aguirre, George, Fountain Valley.
Allen, Gary Charles, Pleasant Hill.
Allen Richard Graham, Long Beach.
Anderson, Clinton H. Jr., El Segundo.
Anderson, Donald Leroy, Jr., Hawthorne.
Anderson, James, Jr., Compton.
Anglii, Patrick Emmett, Long Beach.
Armenta, Heriberto, Los Angeles
Armenta, Ruben Maximo, Pico Rivera.
Armstrong, John Henry, San Diego.
Arredondo, Thomas Alfred, Fresno.
Arreguin, Joe, La Puente.
Aschenbrener, Ervin G., Jr., Fresno.
Austin, Eddie Paul, Coachella.
Avila, John Manuel, Los Angeles.
Bailey, Robert Benton, Yreka.
Baker, Donald Lee, Huntington Park.
Ballin, Joe Magdaleno, Jr., Fresno.
Balters, Stephen A., Jr., San Jose.
Barnard, Gary Michael, Highland.
Bartels, Stephen Donald, Pleasant Hill.
Barth, Wayne Robert, Lodi.
Bartlow, Gary William, Modesto.
Barton, Virgil Wayne, San Diego.
Bauchiero, Harold, Inglewood.
Baumgardner, David Leon, El Cajon.
Bazulto, Salvador, Los Angeles.
Beckermann, Fred Benjamine, Tujunga.
Beeche, Rafael Equardo, San Diego.
Belknap, Ronald Lee, Daly City.
Benegas, Vincent Joseph, Riverside.
Bennett, Donald Lucian, Fairfield.
Benton, Thomas Howard, Sonora.
Berry, William Aaron, Yreka.
Bianchini, Michael Linn, San Francisco.
Bierman, Carroll Monroe, Jr., Garden Grove.
Billingsley, Richard Wayne, Glendale.
Biscailuz, Robert Lynn, Midway City.
Bishop, Russell Laverne, Santa Ana.
Blinder, Richard Bart, Los Angeles.
Bloom, Richard McAuliffe, San Francisco.
Bocanegra, Hugo Arthur, Whittier.
Boda, James Albert, Pico Rivera.
Boetcher, Harold Edward, Milpitas.
Boets, Peter Quirinus, Jr., Cypress.
Bohner, Leonard Allen, San Bernardino.
Booth, Emmett Lee, Encinitas.
Bosh, Anthony Robert, Long Beach.
Boyd, Robert Carl, Newark.
Boyer, Barney Evans, Pleasant Hill.
Boyer, Robert Lee, Long Beach.
Brackins, Vernon Edward, Pasadena.
Bridges, Berry Joe, Bellflower.
Brink, James Richard, Sacramento.
Brookens, Willard, Jr., Los Angeles.
Brooks, Benjimin, Stockton.
Brooks, Lawrence Arthur, Fountain Valley.
Brothers, Gerald John, San Diego.
Brown, Marc Alan, Long Beach.
Browne, Edward Raymond, San Diego.
Browning, Michael Louis, Fullerton.

Buckholdt, Leo Buddy, Santa Cruz.
Burciaga, Robert, Los Angeles.
Burke, John Patrick, Contra Costa.
Burkhart, Eugene Wayne, Palmdale.
Burri, Miguel Ramon, La Mirada.
Burris, Leonard Charles, San Francisco.
Butler, Edward Wayne, Sacramento.
Callan, Philip Michael, Berkeley.
Callis, David George, Redwood City.
Campbell, Robert Dean, South Pasadena.
Candler, Gregory James, Los Angeles.
Cantrell, Phillip Gene, Deland.
Carriere, Oscar Roland, Santa Monica.
Carter, Michael Boyd, Torrance.
Casey, Liam Soueph, Paradise.
Castillo, Charles Mike, Lakewood.
Castillo, Jose, Fresno.
Castillo, Manuel Grijalva, Placentia.
Castro, Juan Jose, Norwalk.
Centeno, Edward Louis, Los Angeles.
Cervantes, George Andrew, Redlands.
Chapp, Robert Anthony, Santa Ana.
Chatfield, Wendell Oliver, Red Bluff.
Childers, James Stanley Be, Pacifica.
Christy, Donald Ray, Yuba City.
Christy, Donald Ray, Yumba City.
Chrysler, Medford Adarine, Pacifica.
Church, Levan Arlin, Hayward.
Churchill, Lawrence Jeffre, Tustin.
Cintron, Jimmie Duayne, Acampo.
Clark, Raymond Charles, Los Angeles.
Cobos, Alfred, Los Angeles.
Compton, William Edgar, III, Long Beach.
Conn, David Bruce, Oakland.
Contreras, Miguel Zaragoza, Corona.
Cook, Michael Dean, Rubidoux.
Cooke, Harold Thomas, San Diego.
Cooley, Ocie Daniel, Baldwin Park.
Conney, James Henry, Camarillo.
Coons, Peter Michael, San Diego.
Corona, Dominic Anthony, Fontana.
Cortez, Richard, Los Angeles,
Courteau, Edward Gerard, Los Angeles.
Coutrakis, George, Ripon.
Cox, Larry James, Weedpatch.
Craig, Thomas Edward, Los Angeles.
Crapo, Ronald Carl, Buena Park.
Crowe, Richard Eyre, Long Beach.
Cruz, Oscar, Escondido.
Cummings, Donald Eugene, Stockton.
Cuozzo, Frank Xavier, Los Angeles.
Curry, Jimmy Douglas, San Jose.
Curry, Robert Erven, Pacifica.
Dalrymyple, Roger Earl, Bakersfield.
Darcy, Michael Chavez, Colton.
De Abre, James Michael, Morgan Hill.
De Lacy, Michael Charles, Los Altos.
Dennis, Hayvard Jr., Los Angeles.
Deocampo, Gregorio Manese, San Francisco.
Dewey, Eric Melvin, Bishop.
Dominguez, Michael Charles, Santa Barbara.
Doran, Patrick Michael, Burlingame.
Dukehart, Stephen Ernest, Gardena.
Dulay, Salvador Redilla, Fairfield.
Duncan, Richard Winerfred, Livermore.
Edwards, Jerrald Leroy, Costa Mesa.
Edwards, Robert Theodore, Lancaster.
Eggleston, Robert Richard, Los Angeles.
Eliason, Wendell Theo, Escalon.
Elliott, Brock Dennis,Manteca.
Elmore, Allan Ladd, Hollywood.
Endsley, Kenneth Richard, Sacramento.
England, Ronald Lee, Lynwood.
Enriquez, Nicholas Ben, Los Angeles.
Ephriam, David Burnell, Los Angeles.
Ernst, Edward Joseph, Torrance.
Ervin, Gregory Allen, Santa Susana.
Escobar, Joseph Sanchez, Fresno.
Esquivel, Jaime, San Jose.
Ewart, John Andrew, Sepulveda.
Felt, David Levant, Sacramento.
Felton, Ruby Edward III, Los Angeles.
Ferguson, Mark Andrew, Lancaster.
Ferguson, Richard Eugene, Covina.
Fernandez, Robert Sanchez, Stockton.
Fierro, Alejandro Francisc, Los Angeles.
Fiorentin, John Velco, Anaheim.
Fish, William Aaron, Oakdale.
Fisher, Dennis Franklin, Alta Loma.
Fisher, Lamarr, Los Angeles.
Fisher, Rickie Davis, Santa Rosa.
Fitzsimmons, James Patrick, Garden Grove.
Flannery, Robert Edward, Jr., St. Helena.
Flickinger, James Edward, Concord.
Flores, Jose DeJesus, Los Angeles.
Folsom, Robert Elmer, San Bruno.
Forbes, Paul Glenn, Jr., San Diego.
Forrest, Stephen Caleb, Westminster.
Foster, Lawrence Eugene, Pacifica.
Foster, Paul Hellstrom, San Francisco.
Foust, Michael Thornton, Victorville.
Franklin, John Henry, Hughson.
Fredsti, Steffan Michael, Simi.
Fromme, Frederick W., Jr., Vallejo.
Frontella, Melvin Lawrence, Mountain View.
Frye, Richard Alan, Venice.
Gabaldon, Tony Eiddie, Reedley.
Galan, David Luis, Huntington Park.
Gale, David Lee, Long Beach.
Galiana, Rudolph Steven, Los Angeles.
Gallegos, Gabriel, San Bernardino.
Gamble, Harry Paul, San Francisco.
Garcia, Edilberto, Orange Cove.
Garcia, Frank Joseph, Redlands.
Garcia, John, Selma.
Garcia, Manuel Mendez, Jr., Los Angeles.
Gazdagh, James Alex, Hawthorne.
Gebhart, Carl Merlin, Jr., Rialto.
Gemas, Terry Dale, Saugus.
Georges, Jerry Harold, Santa Barbara.
Gerard, Lawson Douglas, Santa Monica.
Gilson, Michael Anthony, Sacramento.
Godinez, Alejandro Ray, Los Angeles.
Gonzales, Jimmy Madera.
Gonzalez, Bernardino, Jr., Gardena.
Gooden, Michael Anthony, Bellflower.
Gordon, Johnny Lee, Los Angeles,
Gore, Donald Earl, Ventura.
Gotti, Gale Edward, Westminster.
Granillo, Henry, El Monte.
Grannan, Michael Stephen, Canoga Park.
Grant, Stephen Lee, Torrance.
Grant, Warren Harvey, Jr., Oakland.
Griffiths, Raymond Carson, San Francisco.
Griffiths, Robert Brynley, Long Beach.
Grimes, Michael Bryan, North Hollywood.
Guevara, Ervell Madrid, Gardena.
Gummere, David Dee, La Habra.
Gutierrez, Ernest Lemas, San Jose.
Hahn, Paul Edward, Hawthorne.
Halstead, Wayne Edwin, Burbank.
Hanks, Ernest Beauel, III, Willows.
Hann, David Michel, Santa Monica.
Hardy, Fred Douglas, Pasadena.
Hare, Michael James, Berkeley.
Harmon, Wayne Clark, Downey.
Harrison, Edward Terry, Jr., Los Angeles.
Hartland, Charles Lee, Weaverville.
Hawkins, Thomas Howard, Fullerton.
Hayes, Wayne Norman, Oceanside.
Heekin, Terry Gene, Covina.
Henderson, Hughlen, Los Angeles.
Henderson, John Michael, Oakland.
Henneberg, Robert Joseph, San Francisco.
Henry, Gerald Russell, Hayward.
Henshaw, Thomas Stow, Pacific Palisades.
Herchkorn, Richard Ronald,Walnut Grove.
Herms, Kalus Jurgen, San Dimas.
Hernandez, Alexander Vera, Compton.
Hernandez, Louis Peter, San Bernardino.
Herrera, Philip Arnold, Jr., Selma.
Herrmann, Walter Edwin, III., Buena Park.
Hickman, David Alan, El Cajon.
Hirschmann, Frederick III,, El Toro.
Holcomb, Melvin Douglas, San Jose.
Holley, Bobby Roy, Bakersfield.
Holsclaw, Gary Arthur, Loomis.
Holstius, Michael John, Anaheim.
Holte, Brent Arthur, Bakersfield.
Hoppe, Patrick Bert, San Lorenzo.
Hottinger, Fred Lee, San Jose.
Houser, Dorian Jan, Los Angeles.
Howell, Gatlin Jerryl, Colma.
Hulse, Robert Mark, Los Angeles.
Hummingbird, Ferrell, Oakland.
Hurtado, Albert Steven, National City.
Inscore, Roger Vernon, Huntington Beach.
Insprucker, Glenn Edward, Glendale.
Jackson, Colin Frank, Thousand Oaks.
James, Claude Ray, Oakland.
Johnson, Dennis Charles, Twain Harte.
Johnson, Gerald, Long Beach.
Johnson, Kenneth Michael, San Diego.
Johnson, Stanley Garwood, Applegate.
Jones, Clifford Alan, Porterville.
Jones, James Robert, Long Beach.
Jones, Jimmie Wayne, Merced.
Jones, John Wallace, Fremont.
Jones, Robert Emmett, Corona.
Jordan, Jimmy Dale, Riverbank.
Joys, John William, San Francisco.
Judge, Mark Warren, Torrance.
Kalfas, Allan George, Garden Grove.
Kearney, Charles Daryl, Oakland.
Keith, Danny Joe, Salinas.
Kelley, Roger Virgil, La Mesa.
Kelly, Gregory Paul, La Crescenta.
Kelly, James Raymond, III, Sacramento.
Kennedy, Bruce Leonard, Santa Monica.
Kimmel, Lewis Albert, Jr., Camarillo.
King, Ronald Reed, Burbank.
Kirby, Donald Robert, III, Mountain View.
Kitzmiller, John Lester, Westminster.
Kloese, Wayne Richard, Long Beach.
Knapp, Kenton Don, Los Angeles.
Kolas, Robert Allen, San Diego.
Kolemainen, Michael Walter, Orange.
Kornovich, Frank Dennis, San Rafael.
Kramer, Dennis Dale, Placerville.
Lake, Ronald Lee, Lynwood.
Lara, Arturo Mendoza, Los Angeles.
Larson, Larry Joseph, Carmel.
Lauer, Charles Russell, Downey.
Lazar, George Feodro, San Francisco.
Lewis, Richard Eugene, Los Angeles.
Liggett, Durand Garfield, Downey.
Linder, Garry Harold, Los Angeles.
Linder, George Richard, Gardena.
Long, Floyd Lester, Pasadena.
Lopez, Jose Antonio, Los Angeles.
Lopez, Richard Henry, Los Angeles.
Losoya, Ernest Felipe, Salinas.
Lotta, Phillip Anthony, Sacramento.
Lovell, Ervin, Ontario.
Lowe, Edward Leonard, Pico Rivera.
Lozenski, Richard Ordell, San Mateo.
Lucido, Joseph Bert, ElGranado.
Lyman, Gerald Clyde, San Diego.
Lytle, Clifford James, Los Angeles.
Mallon, Thomas Winston, Millbrae.
Malone, Sidney Jack, Jr., San Diego.
Manning, Jerry Wayne, Lamont.
Margolis, Robert Lynn, Van Nuys.
Martin, Gregory Lawrence, Simi.
Martin, Raymond Charles, Pomona.
Martin, Stephen James, Los Angeles.
Matthews, Alan Lee, Palos Verdes.
Mayo, Gerald Frank, Oakland.
McCall, Douglas Hudson, Hayward.
McCarty, John Leich, Stockton.
McClain, Gary Thomas, Glendale.
McConahay, Michael Paul, Long Beach.
McDonald, Clyde D., II, Santa Ana.
McEntee, Neil Charles, Oakland.
McFarland, Kenneth Earl, Sacramento.
McKee, Thomas Eugene, Palm Springs.
McKenzie, James Calvin, Yorba Linda.
McKinnon, Larry Dee, Sacramento.
McLaughlin, Kirk Alvis, Cottonwood.
McMurdo, James Alfred, Sepulveda.
McNees, Ronald Harvey, Sunland.
McNulty, Milton Keith, Palmdale.
McPhee, Randy Neal, Long Beach.
Meister, George Frederick, Rancho Cordova.
Mendoza, Antonio, Biola.
Mendoza, Jose Medel, Compton.
Merrill, Dennis Lee, Grove City.
Metzger, Russell Edward, North Highland.
Miguel, Michael Joseph, Lemoore.
Millard, Kenneth Arthur, Long Beach.
Miller, Gary Ames, Grass Valley.
Miner, Michael Robert, San Luis Obispo.
Mitchell, Earnest Darrell, Garden Grove.
Mitchell, James McNally, Encinitas.
Moffett, Melvin Glen, Covina.
Monfils, Dennis Eugene, Riverside.
Mooney, John Howard Jr., Lakewood.
Moore, Ronald Allan, Manhattan Beach.
Moore, Walter Zampier Jr., Los Angeles.
Moore, William Robert, Richmond.

Morand, Brad William, Riverside.
Morgan, Mark Lake, San Bruno.
Morrill, David Whittier, San Carlos.
Mos, Ronald Bruce, Lamont.
Moses, Willie Lee, Los Angeles.
Moshier, Jim Edwin, Bakersfield.
Mulick, Michael William, Poway.
Murphy, Robert Emmett, Jr., Compton.
Myers, Charles Dean, Jr., Durate.
Neal, Stephen Browning, Santa Barbara.
Negranza, Mariano R., Jr., Roseville.
Nelson, Gary Nels, Glendale.
Nevarez, Alexandro, Stockton.
Neves, Manuel Catano, Tracy.
Nichols, Douglas Ellsworth, San Pedro.
Nicholson, James Arthur, Anaheim.
Noble, Morris Allan, San Pablo.
Norris, John Alexander, III, Los Banos.
O'Brien, Chester Lavern, Jr., Taft.
O'Connor, Dennis Alfred, Anaheim.
Oberle, David Alan, Walnut Creek.
Okamoto, Donald Ray, National City.
Ortiz, Reinaldo Salvador, San Francisco.
Owens, Jack Coleman, San Jose.
Owens, Red, Santa Monica.
Pacheco, Jose Anthony, Los Angeles.
Padilla, Antonio Duarte, Wilmington.
Page, Steve Wilson, Oxnard.
Paine, Victor Llewellyn, South Fork.
Painter, John Ralph, Jr., Palmdale.
Painter, Robert Lee, Long Beach.
Palczewski, Edmund Lawrence, Sacramento.
Palma, Raymond Barela, Pacoima.
Pappas, Ralph Byron, Presidio.
Parish, Frank Brennan, Riverside.
Parish, Michael Lawrence, Perris.
Parker, Larry Thomas, Fresno.
Parker, Maxim Charles, Rolling Hills.
Partridge, Douglas Elwood, Martell.
Patterson, Bruce Dixon, Glendale.
Patterson, Daniel Arthur, Eureka.
Patterson, Steven Craig, Huntington Park.
Patton, Dorris, Edward, San Francisco.
Pedersen, Fred Lewis, Azusa.
Pehrson, Dale Christopher, Redding.
Pene, Ronald Edward, Hacienda Heights.
Perdue, Don Melvin, Oceanside.
Perez, Ernest Eustace, Lone Pine.
Perich, John Whilden, Bakersfield.
Perkins, Ronald James, Pacoima.
Perkins, William Thomas, Jr., Sepulveda.
Peterson, Dennie Donald, Los Angeles.
Petrick, Ronald Paul, Montclair.
Phillips, John Michael, Orange.
Piatt, Richard Weaver, Los Angeles.
Pittenger, Donald Alan, Los Angeles.
Plake, James Roland, Carmarillo.
Poirier, Roger Milton, Redondo Beach.
Porter, Ronald William, Antioch.
Presby, Thomas Frank, Sunland.
Prescott, William Sherwin, Rolling Hills.
Quigley, James Michael, Hollywood.
Quinn, Douglas Frank, Eureka.
Quinn, Terry Lee, Huntington Beach.
Randazzo, Joseph Anthony, Modesto.
Ratliff, Paul Wayne, Torrance.
Rauch, Edward Harold, San Francisco.
Reagan, John Walter, Los Angeles.
Reaves, Homer Lee, Pomana.
Reed, Robert William, San Francisco.
Reeves, Gordon Michael, San Mateo.
Reilly, Robert John, Jr., Walnut Creek.
Reyes, Ronald David, Edison.
Reynolds, Joseph Ray, Compton.
Riate, Alfonso Ray, Bell Gardens.
Riley, James Calvin, Pleasant Hill.
Roberts, Clifford Alton, San Bruno.
Robertson, Clifton Boyd, Jr., Los Angeles.
Robinson, Mark Edward, Manhattan Beach.
Roe, Phillip Willard, Riverside.
Roland, George Ray, Casitas Springs.
Rose, Dana Gale, Santa Rosa.
Rose, David Lee, Santa Clara.
Ross, Larry Edward, Navato.
Ross, Raymond Jefferson, Jr., Norwalk.
Ross, Robert Garry, El Monte.
Ruiz, Raymond, Los Angeles.
Rundle, Danny Ray, Whittier.
Runnels, Lloyd Chisolm, Jr., San Diego.
Salazar, Gilbert Solano, Pico Rivera.
Samson, Francisco Leo, Jr., San Francisco.
Samson, Michael Roman, Antioch.
San Marcos, Edmond, Long Beach.
Sanchez, Jimmy Pineda, Los Angeles.
Sanchez, Santos, Selma.
Sanders, Harvey Richard, Garden Grove.
Sands, Thomas Michael, Monrovia.
Satcher, Charles Sherlee, Vallejo.
Sauer, Philip Howard, Coronado.
Shaina, Conrad William, Santa Susana.
Shalhoob, Terry Wayne, Santa Barbara.
Shamel, John Clarence, Thousand Oaks.
Sharp, Samuel Arthur, Jr., San Jose.
Sherrell, David Frank, Woodland Hills.
Shields, Alan Harry, Los Angeles.
Shoemaker, David Howard, San Jose.
Shook, George Leonard, Jr., Hermosa Beach.
Short, Mitchell Conrad, Canoga Park.
Shults, Walter Glenn, Oakland.
Silas, Theodore Buchanan, Los Angeles.
Silva, Federico, San Bernardino.
Simpson, Alfred Franklin, Gardena.
Sitler, Barry James, Compton.
Smith, John Calvin, Sacramento.
Smith, Michael Bruce, Fairfield.
Smith, Michael Rex, Red Bluff.
Smith, Philip Jeremiah, Redwood.
Smith, Timothy N., Jr., Santa Ana.
Soliz, Thomas, Bakersfield.
Solley, John Joseph, San Diego.
Sorensen, Donald Robert, Lakewood.
Sorrov, Charles Finney, Jr., Santa Barbara.
Sousa, Robert Patrick, Alameda.
Speer, Byron Morrow, San Marine.
Srsen, Steve Albert, San Lorenzo.
St. Louis, Bruce Wayne, Newhall.
Staab, Kurt Clarence, El Centro.
Stansell, Richard Norris, Los Angeles.
Stelle, Gerald Cain, Temple City.
Stevens, Tamadge Cecil, Jr., Sacramento.
Stevens, Walter Bruce, San Diego.
Stewart, Richard James, El Monte.
Stirling, Elgin Leroy, San Bernardino.
Stoker, Kenneth Grant, Alameda.
Stokes, Charles Eugene, Santa Ana.
Stutes, William Byron, Oceanside.
Suniga, Michael Edward, Ojai.
Suzuki, Kenny Ryosuke, Santa Monica.
Swayze, Richard David, Santa Maria.
Taboada, Adolfo Antonio, Jr., Los Angeles.
Tagata, Laavale Fuatau, San Francisco.
Tague, Nicholas Allen, Fillmore.
Talley, Harold Lee, Glendora.
Talmon, Peter George, III, Los Angeles.
Tamayo, Francisco Mario, Jr., Sacramento.
Tandy, Michael Gordon, Novato.
Tarango, Ernesto, Los Angeles.
Tate, Fennell, Los Angeles.
Tate, Fred Eugene, Hollywood.
Tedds, Mervyn Donald, Mountain View.
Tela, Molimau Asomaliu, San Pedro.
Thompson, Edgar Wayne, San Francisco.
Titsworth, Kenneth Carl, San Jose.
Toleson, Thomas Norman, Willow Creek.
Trevino, Juan Ramon, Calwa.
Tryon, Fred Albert, Jr., Downey.
Tunstill, Frank, Jr., Los Angeles.
Turcotte, Ralph Jean, Santa Ana.
Ucker, David John, Palo Alto.
Ueli, Peni, Wilmington.
Ullmer, William Arthur, Jr., Escondido.
Upchurch, Rodney Cleveland, Palo Alto.
Vagnone, Richard Bernard, Norwalk.
Valencia, Ralph Mario, Monterey Park.
Vallerand, Larkin Oscar, Tracy.
Valtierra, Juan Borja, Merced.
Vanover, Paul Phillip, Castro Valley.
Varner, Jerry Daniel, Los Angeles.
Vasquez, Mark Anthony, City of Commerce.
Vasquez, Patrick John, San Jose.
Vaughn, Richard William, San Luis Obispo.
Velasquez, Antonio, Santa Maria.
Verdugo, Daniel Alexander, Whittier.
Vergano, Robert Thomas, Merced.
Vigil, Arthur Vernon, San Francisco.
Villegas, Ralph Paul, San Pedro.
Wagner, Richard Allen, Stockton.
Wagner, Russell Mark, Vallejo.
Wagner, Walter Adolph, Redwood City.
Wagner, Wayne Douglas, Porterville.
Walker, Thomas James, San Jose.
Walkinshaw, George Myron, Long Beach.
Ward, Robert David, Yucaipa.
Warner, Charles William F., Santa Monica.
Warner, Herbert Alvin, Jr., Long Beach.
Watson, Arthur Jr., Los Angeles.
Wheatley, William George, San Francisco.
Whipple, Clifford Leroy, Downey.
Whisenhunt, James Henry, Crescent City.
Whitehead, Charles Frankli, Mill Valley.
Willard Frederick R., Jr., Glendora.
Williams, Barry Hennett, Saratoga.
Williams, John David, Claremont.
Wittman, Narvin Otto, Jr., Coronado.
Wright, Steven James, Norco.
Xavier, Augusto Maria, San Jose.
Yager, John Corwin, Granada Hills.
Yarnell, Daniel David, Highland.
Zimberlin, Robert E., Jr., San Diego.
Ziss, Emil Roger, Concord.
Zoboblish, Donald, Inglewood.
Zuniga, Leon, Jr., Imperial Beach.

Navy

Allred, Frank Leroy, Jr., Fresno.
Amspacher, William H., Jr., Canoga Park.
Antone, Frank George, Carmel.
Avila, Manuel, Jr., Fresno.
Balch, James Iverson, Fresno.
Ballauf, Charles Alan, Oxnard.
Bennett, Daniel Joseph, Beverly Hills.
Birch, Daniel Patrick, Los Angeles.
Bird, Harold Alvin, Boulder Creek.
Boyd, Billy Ray, San Bernardino.
Boyle, David Joseph, Woodland.
Brown, Donald Hubert, Jr., Berkeley.
Burns, William Carl, Jr., San Mateo.
Carey, Michael William, Rescue.
Carver, Bobby Don, Richmond.
Center, Robert Lee, Inglewood.
Chambers, Steven Doyle, Fresno.
Cooper, Edwin Earl, Chula Vista.
Croxen, Richard Lynn, Westminster.
Di Napoli, Michael Joseph, La Mesa.
Dibble, Gorden John, Los Angeles.
Duggan, William Joseph, Lynwood.
Edie, Kurt Charles, Sunnyvale.
Esqueda, Arthur Diaz, Chino.
Estok, Michael David, San Bernardino.
Farrell Bruce Charles, San Francisco.
Flowers, Wilson Nathenial, East Palo Alto.
Frye, Donald Patrick, Los Angeles.
Fuentes, Hector, Riverside.
Gelien, Walter John, Oakland.
Gingerich, Gregory Ray, Redondo Beach.
Godwin, Joseph Samuel, Saugus.
Graham, Gilbert James, Anaheim.
Hessom, Robert Charles, Alameda.
Higgins, John Ignatius, Jr., Chula Vista.
Hill, Arthur Sinclair, Jr., Rancho Santa Fe.
Hill, Paul Wayne, Upper Lake.
Holderman, Bruce Edward, Santa Barbara.
Hom, Charles David, Huntington Park.
Hoover, William Clifton, San Diego.
Kardell, David Allen, Sonoma.
Kelley, Joe Franklin, Applegate.
Kirstein, Daniel Lynn, Pasadena.
Laws, Richard Lee, Sacramento.
Maguire, Christopher J., III, San Diego.
Mape, John Clement, Dublin.
Markillie, John Roy, Modesto.
McHam, Richard Hugh, Sunland.
Miller, Calvin Leroy, Wishon.
Miller, Robert Lester, Salinas.
Mullan, Charles Richard, Jr., Berkeley.
Najarian, Michael Anthony, La Crescenta.
Northup, David Wayne, Campbell.
Paine, Edward Arthur, Redondo Beach.
Perez, Arthur Carlyle, San Diego.
Perry, Antone, Jr., Union City.
Peterson, Dennis William, Huntington Park.
Pogre, Bob Elia, San Francisco.
Potter, William Vernon, Maywood.
Quiroga, Alex Leon, San Jose.
Rawsthorne, Edgar Arthur, Miramar.
Rudolph, Robert David, Encino.
Sather, Richard Christian, Pomona.
Shea, James Patrick, Burlingame.
Smith, Michael Frank, Fairfax.
Smith, Wiselee, San Francisco.
Stiles, Charles Walter, Agnew.

Taylor, Jesse Junior, Los Alamitos.
Thirkettle, Michael John, Whittier.
Thomas, Darwin Joel, Santa Clara.
Thomas, Harry Eugene, Taft.
Thompson, William Dewey, Jr., Healdsburg.
Thornton, Gary Lynn, Porterville.
Vaughan, Robert Reddington, Los Angeles.
Vedros, Randolph Paul, Mountain View.
Walters, John Brady, Long Beach.
Wilson, Claude David, Jr., Stockton.

Army

Amison, Roosevelt, Jr., Los Angeles.
Anders, Edward James, Los Angeles.
Anderson, James Edward, Eureka.
Arnold, Odis Daniel, Santa Monica.
Beard, Billie Lester, Lompoc.
Belnap, Glen Dean, Red Bluff.
Bettger, Gene Lyle, Calaveras.
Bibler, Wilson E., Jr., Chula Vista.
Birdsell, George David, Carlotta.
Boyd, William Demarr, Los Angeles.
Bradley, Ray Eugene, Huntington Beach.
Brodnik, Franklin Vincent, San Francisco.
Brown, James Edward, Shafter.
Broyles, Ivan Joseph, Long Beach.
Broyles, Lanham Odell, Oildale.
Butcher, John Henry, Jr., Richmond.
Camarena-Salazar, Eduardo, El Centro.
Carpenter, Charles, Oakland.
Carrillo, George J., Jr., San Jose.
Carroll, John Thomas, Lomita.
Carter, Wendell Louil, Madera.
Chandler, Robert Hugheston, Los Angeles.
Cook, Robert Paul, El Monte.
Cowell, Robert Blanco, Santa Maria.
Dawes, John James, Madera.
Dawson, Daniel George, Fort Bragg.
De Marco, Frank John, Yuba City.
De Mello, Robert Bruce, Fremont.
Dieball, Dennis Ray, Oceano.
Dispensiero, Douglas Louis, Los Angeles.
Dornbergh, William L., Jr., Modesto.
Durell, Alger Edgar, Jr., Fair Oaks.
Dykes, Richard Monroe, San Jose.
Escalante, Domingo, Jr., Santa Ana.
Feland, Theodore Glen, Sonoma.
Fenton, Robert Allen, Boyes.
Fillmore, Ronald Richard, San Francisco.
Fisher, Edward Stephan, Eagle Rock.
Fortune, Roger Lee, Santa Ana.
Galambos, Joseph Gary, Sonora.
Galvin, James Patrick, Davis.
Gardner, Glenn Virgil, San Bernardino.
Gonderman, Frank Lee, Concord.
Garalla, Donald Michael, Los Alamitos.
Gray, Bernard Leroy, Colton.
Guaraldi, Thomas Joseph, San Francisco.
Hakes, Clifford Edward, Rialto.
Heihn, Dennis Ray, San Pablo.
Henderson, Frank Harel, Los Angeles.
Henrey, Richard Dee, Solvang.
Hensley, Leroy, San Jose.
Hershner, Dennis L., Crestline.
Hines, Vaughn M., Arcadia.
Hoeffs, John Harvey, Oceanside.
Horton, Marshal Lynn, Long Beach.
Hughes, John Charles, Redlands.
Huntley, Thomas Matthew, Bishop.
Hurst, Howard E., San Jose.
Insel, Laurence Alan, Beverly Hills.
Jager, Ronald V., Jr., Stockton.
Jenks, Richard Dale, San Bernardino.
Johnson, James J. L., San Francisco.
Karasch, Wolfgang Werner, Gilroy.
Keeler, Ralph Leroy, Taft.
Kidd, Norman Richard, Jr., Montrose.
Kline, Robert Daniel, Long Beach.
Knight, Chester Wilford, Smith Flat.
Kohler, Ludwig Peter, San Francisco.
Lavery, Owen Thomas, San Bruno.
Leonard, Edwin N., Richmond.
Lester, James Robert, Stockton.
Ligons, Daryl Lee, Los Angeles.
Lonzo, Angelo Albert, Benicia.
Lovenguth, Terrance Lee, Raymond.
Lyons, William John, Banning.
Marcum, Ronald Dean, Monte Rio.
Marquez, Paul Joseph, San Pedro.
McDowell, Melvin Warren, Delhi.
Melendrez, Robert Charles, Whittier.
Montgomery, William Eugene, Healdsburg.
Morton, Edward Earl, Los Angeles.
Murphy, Jerry Ray, Tujunga.
Nagato, Yoshiiwa, Los Angeles.
Nava, Salvador Martinez, Niland.
Nelson, Leon Grover, Garden Valley.
Nelson, Michael Roy, Garden Grove.
Nelson, Terrance William, Sacramento.
Oates, Robert Wayne, Paicines.
Ogas, Phillip Arthur, Lindsay.
Ortiz, Pedro, Selma.
Pack, Fred Walter, Lompoc.
Parks, David Norton, Concord.
Pashman, Stephen Mark, Santa Cruz.
Pearson, Arnold C., Los Angeles.
Peterson, Galen Dean, Loma Linda.
Phillips, William Joseph, Pasadena.
Phipps, Donald Ray, San Jose.
Quiros, Carlos Manuel, Los Angeles.
Rains, Vernon Barton, San Mateo.
Rainville, Randall Brian, Fair Oaks.
Raschel, Thomas Reginald, Pasadena.
Ridings, Louis, Big Bear Lake.
Rist, Gary Michael, San Bruno.
Robertson, William S. III, San Jose.
Rodrigues, Gary Wayne, Napa.
Rodigues, John N., Redwood City.
Rose, Roger Clarke, Pasadena.
Rowen, Gerald Loyd II, Hermosa Beach.
Russell, Allen Bartley, Hayward.
Saffle, Edgar Joe, Los Angeles.
Schoenbaum, Craig Ray, Arcadia.
Scott, James George, Woodland.
Seastrom, William Leonar, Los Angeles.
Seeley, John Stuart, Stockton.
Seeman, Jeri Calvin, San Bernardino.
Severloh, Paul Bruce, Temple City.
Sewell, Donald Melvin, Ventura.
Simons, Ernest Eugene, Vallejo.
Skirvin, Orval L., Hawthorne.
Starr, Kieran John, Palo Alto.
Steimer, Robert Fenton, Inglewood.
Strange, Robert Greer, Oakland.
Suarez, Jose Wilfredo, San Francisco.
Tallman, George, Huntington Beach.
Tapio, Heinz Arnold, Sun Valley.
Tasker, David Leroy, Encino.
Tighe, Raymond Howard, Winton.
Torres, Frank Chico, Jr., Walnut Creek.
Tunall, Stanley Williams, El Monte.
Uding, Stanley Roy, San Pablo.
Uhlig, Michael Steven, Granada Hills.
Uribe, Edward Anthony, Los Angeles.
Urrabazo, Homer, San Jose.
Van Lant, Wayne G., Artesia.
Veach, Richard Elzie, Riverside.
Vilardo, Ronald Allan, Sacramento.
Wallace, Arnold Brian, San Leandro.
Walrod, Richard Arthur, Los Angeles.
Welch, Richard Ernest, Lakeside.
Wesselman, Gary Leroy, Montebello.
Whitaker, G. W., Oakland.
White, Franklin Ralph, West Sacramento.
Whitt, Mark Alan, Hollywood.
Wightman, David Lloyd, III, Fair Oaks.
Williams, Dennis Lee, Westminister.
Williams, Frank Duval, Fresno.
Willis, Harold Eugene, Bishop.
Yamashita, Akira, San Francisco.
Zabala, Salvador, Jr., Menlo Park.

Coast Guard

Brostrom, David Charles, Los Altos.

Air Force

Armond, Robert Laurence, San Mateo.
Britt, Aquilla Friend, El Cajon.
Cairns, Robert Alexander, Highland.
Chaney, David Michael, Santa Rosa.
Dawson, Paul Glen, Culver City.
Graves, Harold Leonard, Oakland.
Hottenroth, James Randall, Montclair.
Humphrey, John Richard, Fair Oaks.
Kannel, Donald Lee, Los Angeles.
King, Ronald Runyan, Santa Cruz.
Lynch, William Affley, Jr., San Francisco.
Martin, Kenneth William, Escondido.
McNally, James William, Los Angeles.
Neville, William Edward, El Cajon.
Riley, Alden Laverne, San Diego.
Robertson, Joe Carrol, Salinas.
Ruyff, Ronald Paul, Long Beach.
Snyder, John Herbert, Santa Rosa.
Sorensen, Odin Edgar, San Francisco.
Waltman, Jesse Lyle, Dixon.
Weikal, William Byron, Jr., Inglewood.
Wright, Dennis Paul, Taft.

Marine Corps

Akstin, James Michael, Richmond.
Alcantar, Frank Cosme, San Bernardino.
Allender, Frank Ross, Jr., Ventura.
Almaraz, Ronald Paul, Los Angeles.
Baccus, Jimmy Dever, Lawndale.
Bass, Gary Nolan, Sacramento.
Beach, Arthur James, Orange Cove.
Blaney, Thomas Arthur, San Diego.
Bright, Richard, Chula Vista.
Campbell, Eugene Charles, Redwood Valley.
Carranza, Martin, Oakland.
Castro, Reinaldo Antonio, Pacific Grove.
Christopher, Anthony Phill, Los Angeles.
Cobb, John Wesley, Pomona.
Cook, Michael Frank, Harbor City.
Corrie, Mark Lane, Aptos.
Crossen, Michael O., Bloomington.
Crouse, Jeffrey Charles, Los Angeles.
Daniels, Tommy Leon, Santa Ana.
Durr, Lavall, Castroville.
Earles, Fred Thomas, Bellflower.
Eaton, Bruce Horace, San Gabriel.
Ellis, Gene Howard, Jr., Sacramento.
Ferrante, Gilbert, Ontario.
Freeman, Darell Goodwin, Salinas.
Galvin, Ralph Forrester, Redwood City.
Gilliam, John Perry, Oxnard.
Henry, Ronald Jerome, Pomona.
Herrera, Michael Ward, Los Angeles.
Hunsbarger, Gerald C., III, Sacramento.
Hunt, William Raymond, Richmond.
Johnson, John Harry, Santa Ana.
Kieswetter, Gerard Martin, Colton.
King, Robert Wayne, Montclair.
Koehler, James Kevin, Walnut Creek.
Lawson, Leo Charles, San Leandro.
MacGeary, Fred Ernest, Inglewood.
Martinez, Rodney Dean, Galt.
Mathis, Brent Eugene, North Hollywood.
Meckel, John Blocker, Lakewood.
Miles, Ronald David, Mill Valley.
Molina, Agapito, Jr., San Bernardino.
Mucha, Henry, Jr., Westminster.
Murphy, Joseph Patrick, Long Beach.
Musguire, Glen Alan, Lomita.
Parker, Victor Ralph, Perris.
Quinn, Patrick Owen, La Crescenta.
Senz, Francisco Xavier, Culver City.
Salinas, Joe Manuel, Norwalk.
Shelton, Charles Thomas, Selma.
Shrout, Sanford, Jr., Hayward.
Silverii, Louis Zane, West Covina.
Spencer, Leandrew Jr., Los Angeles.
Stowe, Luthe Tony, North Edwards.
Tomlinson, Michael James, Van Nuys.
Wangler, Lossy Ray, Alameda.
Western, Aaron Harold, Los Angeles.
Wood, Patrick Lee, Riverside.
Worrell, Gary Paul, Placerville.

Navy

Butler, Joseph Milton, Culver City.
Carter, Rodney Balaam, Porterville.
Clements, William Richard, Hayward.
Curtis, Gary Stillman, Bell Gardens.
Dawson, Thomas Joe, Jr., San Jose.
Deardorff, Herold Troy, Norco.
Dye, James Cletus, Ventura.
Dyer, James Richard, El Monte.
Dyke, Robert Louis, Alamo.
Gilliland, John Henry III, Riverside.
Guerra, Raul Antonio, Riverside.
Hessman, Ronald Anthony, Los Angeles.
Hester, Leo Claude, Heber.
Josephson, Hartley Michael, Canoga Park.
Keen, Daryl La Verne, Santa Cruz.
Long, Lewis Benton, Kingsburg.
Luc, Frank Leo, San Diego.
Mayo, Dudley Wayne, Bellflower.
McDonld, George Columbus, Los Angeles.
Messer, Sigurd Martin, Eldridge.
Newby, Gary Eugene, Sacramento.
Owens, Richard Lee, Fresno.
Ownby, Edward Allan Joseph, Nevada City.
Ramirez, Vincent Albert, Richmond.
Reed, Gregg Erwin, Santa Clara.
Rush, William Ardie, Los Angeles.
Searfus, William Henry, Los Angeles.

Shanks, Donald Wilfred, Crescent City.
Staud, Robert Nicolas, Modesto.
Steimer, Thomas Jack, Piedmont.
Strain, Kenneth Dale, Fair Oaks.
Strong, Daniel Leroy, Big Bear City.
Tessman, Clarence Clement, San Diego.
Waldron, Steven, Baldwin Park.
Wensel, Norman Byron, Torrance.
Wildauer, Paul Arthur, Chula Vista.

Army

Abbie, Donald Paul, Sacramento.
Abbott, Edward Donald, Yuba City.
Abraham, Paul Leonard, Santa Ana.
Achor, Terrence William, Whittier.
Acosta, John Michael, Sacramento.
Adair, Harvey Gene, Kingsburg.
Adams, Gilles David, Alta Loma.
Adams, James Lindell, Pittsburg.
Adams, Paul Edwin, Garden Grove.
Aguiar, Juan Daniel, Oakland.
Ahern, John Bernard, Delhi.
Akamu, Albert Kaiwi, San Francisco.
Akins, Samuel Leroy, Los Angeles.
Albert, Raymond Howard, Jr., Imperial Beach.
Aleshire, Ronald Lee, San Jose.
Alexander, Robert Emmet, Los Angeles.
Alford, Michael Lynn, Redlands.
Alfred, Thomas Samuel, Oceanside.
Allen, Larry Hugh, San Diego.
Allen, Wayne Anderson, Oceanside.
Alvarez, Charles Allen, Santee.
Alvarez, Jimmie Marron, San Jose.
Alvarez, Michael Byron, Madera.
Andersen, Michael Nile, Downey.
Andersen, William T., Jr., Tehachapi.
Anderson, James Boyd, Sunland.
Anderson, James Howard, Anaheim.
Antognini, Joseph, III, San Jose.
Aragon, Alonso, Jr., San Jose.
Arambula, Paul Tejeda, Oakland.
Arellano, Leroy Fred, Santa Cruz.
Artavia, Joseph Gregory, San Francisco.
Avila, Jesus V., Dinuba.
Bachelor, Don Ray, Caruthers.
Baggett, Frank Allen, Williams.
Bailey, Alfred Leon, Jr., Los Angeles.
Baird, Ronald Eugene, Pittsburg.
Baker, Robert Nelson, Santa Ana.
Bakkie, Donald Keith, Sacramento.
Ballard, Mel Roy, Redding.
Banaga, Salvador M. L., Jr., Holtville.
Banglos, Gary Alan, San Francisco.
Banuelos, Albert A., Jr., San Diego.
Barger, Ferdinand Ora, Jr., Bakersfield.
Barker, Robert Lee, Jr., Esparto.
Barnes, Francis Archer, San Bernardino.
Barnhouse, Darrel Emerson, Richmond.
Barovetto, John Lawrence, Davis.
Barton, Val E., Redwood Estates.
Bates, Wayne Sherwood, San Pablo.
Battiest, Andrew, Calipatria.
Baumann, Rene Georges, Walnut Creek.
Beals, Ronnie Herbert, Sacramento.
Beardsley, Ronald Allen, Napa.
Beck, Steven Lee, Atherton.
Bedolla, Joseph Lopez, Gilroy.
Behm, Stanley William, Escondido.
Bell, Edward Allen, Burbank.
Bell, Howard Clayton, Long Beach.
Bell, John Martin, Morro Bay.
Bellomo, Terrence John, Santa Clara.
Beltran, Robert Leon, Fremont.
Benes, Wayne Joseph, Upland.
Benson, Robert William, Bakersfield.
Berg, Ray William Jr., San Lorenzo.
Bergren, Thomas Howard, San Jose.
Berry, David Joe, Bellflower.
Bertsch, Brent John, Lodi.
Bettencourt, Daniel F., Jr., San Diego.
Biernacki, James Richard, Chula Vista.
Bieser, Karl Roy, San Diego.
Birden, Lee Roy, Oakland.
Birdwell, Michael Del, Modesto.
Bishop, Michael Richard, Napa.
Blakely, William, Castro Valley.
Blankenship, James Arlia, Gardena.
Blasingame, Norman Lee, Los Angeles.
Blume, Dale L., Rosemead.
Bobbitt, Arthur, Chula Vista.
Bolster, Christopher Oran, Pomona.
Bolton, David Joseph, Marysville.
Boots, James Allen, Oroville.
Borgen, Carl Lee, Manteca.
Bottan, Daniel Jacques, Santa Paula.
Boudreaux, Allen John, Riverside.
Bowen, Larry William, Cupertino.
Bowman, Stephen Wesley, Alta Loma.
Box, Houston Clifford, Jr., Sacramento.
Boyd, John Lee, Los Angeles.
Boyle, Harry Lewis, San Leandro.
Bradshaw, Henry Lee, Long Beach.
Brady, James Gregory, Sacramento.
Breitenbach, Bernard Paul, El Cerrito.
Bretches, Raymond Dean, Santa Barbara.
Brewer, John Newton, Sonoma.
Bric, William Henry III, Burbank.
Bricmont, Francis Peter, Jr., Los Gatos.
Brierly, James Kenneth, Carlsbad.
Brocker, Thomas George, San Jose.
Brophy, Daniel Ralph, Oceanside.
Brown, Alvin Ray, Tulare.
Brown, Donald Lynn, Stockton.
Brown, Gary Wayne, Los Angeles.
Brown, Gerald Ray, Los Angeles.
Brown, Marshall Jason, Hyampow.
Brown, Richard Albert, Santa Clara.
Brown, Robert Alva II, Needles.
Buehler, Robert Henry, Napa.
Bundage, Cecil Odell, Seaside.
Burbage, Raymond Douglas, Norwalk.
Burns, Dean Harry, Sonoma.
Burrola, Sammy, Jr., Buena Park.
Burson, David Richard, Los Angeles.
Butler, Kenneth Allan, Jr., Willits.
Butorovic, Steve, San Pedro.
Butts, John Michael, Covina.
Buys, Kenneth Allen, Anaheim.
Buzzard, Larry B., Sacramento.
Byrd, Bobby John, San Bruno.
Byrnes, Robert Scott, Carmichael.
Calderon, Julio Alfredo, Los Angeles.
Call, Richard Joseph, San Bernardino.
Callahan, John Marshall, Jr., San Diego.
Calle-Zuluaga Fernando, Los Angeles.
Cardin, Willis Glen, San Lorenzo.
Carl, Arthur Jack, Upland.
Carlson, James Clark, Salinas.
Carlson, Richard Allan, San Francisco.
Carmona, Efren, El Monte.
Carr, Gregory Vernon, Santa Barbara.
Carrand, Jackie Andrew, Cypress.
Carter, Thurl Guy, III, Hayward.
Carvajal, Joseph Carlos, Norwalk.
Casey, Richard William, Los Altos.
Cash, David Manfred, Pasadena.
Casper, Ronald Jerome Dent, Santa Ana.
Castaneda, Benjamin Frank, Oakland.
Castaneda, Hugo Carlos, Compton.
Castillo, Manuel Angel, San Jose.
Castro, Jorge Arturo, Los Angeles.
Catt, Joseph Francis, Jr., Huntington Beach.
Cervantes, Gerald, San Jose.
Chaney, Donald Lee, Riverbank.
Chaney, Douglas Dale, Redondo Beach.
Charles, Ronnie Joe, South Gate.
Chase, Charles Joseph, San Mateo.
Chavez, Jesus Ernest, Jr., Pico Rivera.
Chervony, Eddie Edwin, Los Angeles.
Chilcott, Ronald Harry, Pico Rivera.
Chisum, David, Salinas.
Cho, Herbert Pok Dong, Lynwood.
Choi, William David, Watsonville.
Christer, Eugene Merl, Salinas.
Christy, Richard Thomas, Boulder Creek.
Church, John Leonard, Norwalk.
Cigar, Freddie Joe, San Pedro.
Clark, Donald Eugene, Fremont.
Clark, Doyle Wayne, Santa Clara.
Clark, James Lee, Richmond.
Clarke, Walter Kirt, El Cajon.
Cleem, Larry Lloyd, Midway City.
Clifford, Harold John, Daly City.
Cubarrubias, Roberto, San Jose.
Cobb, Tyler William, Jr., La Puente.
Cohen, Robert Bruce, Los Angeles.
Coleman, Donald Huston, Healdsburg.
Collier, Timothy Lynn, Madera.
Collins, Bruce Wayne, Ontario.
Collins, Clint, Long Beach.
Combs, Kenneth Dale, Camarillo.
Contreras, Benito, Jr., Whittier.
Cook, Charles Joseph, West Covina.
Cook, Charles, Jr., San Francisco.
Cook, John W., Long Beach.
Coonrod, Robert Lee, Napa.
Cooper, Robert Gean, Azusa.
Cornell, Ricky Lynn, Salinas.
Corrigan, Michael Joseph, Burbank.
Cotterell, Jack Patrick, Bellflower.
Courtney, Joe Ray, Jr., Reseda.
Cox, Freddie James, Jr., Oakland.
Cox, Gregory Ellis, Pleasant Hill.
Crabb, Winford R., Shafter.
Craig, Michael Dennis, Rosemead.
Crane, Robert Irving, Montgomery Creek.
Cranford, Thomas William, Redding.
Criswell, Robert Reed, San Francisco.
Crook, James Peyton, La Mesa.
Crosby, James Allen, San Diego.
Crum, Daryl Wayne, Garden Grove.
Cryan, Kenneth Michael, San Mateo.
Cuellar, Pilar Joseph, Tulare.
Culbertson, Samuel Kent, Huntington Beach.
Curley, Raymond Nelson, Orange.
Daffer, Joseph John, Modesto.
Dahlin, David Courtney, Reseda.
Daniel, Johnnie Lloyd, Montclair.
Darrah, Gary Koyle, Los Angeles.
Daughton, Joseph D., Jr., San Leandro.
David, Michael Dennis, Baldwin Park.
Davidove, Ernest Frederic, China Lake.
Davis, Charles Edward, Galt.
Davis, Dale Leroy, Santa Rosa.
Davis, James Allen, Whittier.
Davis, John Edwin, San Pablo.
Davis, Walter Scott, Pasadena.
De Graw, Charles Ivan, Thousand Oaks.
De La Pena, Gilbert, Pinedale.
De La Rosa, Larry A., Jr., Baldwin Park.
De Lapp, William C. III, Pacific Palisades.
De Mello, Clyde Lawrence, El Cerrito.
De Nardo, Frank Michael, Jr., Covina.
De Vore, Edward Allen, Jr., Harbor City.
Del Castillo, Marco Oscar, Los Angeles.
Delgado, Ray, Richmond.
Delgado, Richard Falcon, Fresno.
Delp, Kenneth Harvey, Los Angeles.
DeMara, Juan Joseph, Santa Paula.
Denton, David Andrew, Upland.
Derig, Patrick Martin, Santa Maria.
Desilets, William J., Anaheim.
Detrick, Robert Lloyd, Montara.
Diaz, Gary Michael, Redondo Beach.
Dietz, Wolf-Dieter, San Jose.
Dillon, George Alfred Ched, San Anselmo.
Dineen, Timothy John, Vallejo.
Dismaya, Eddie, Jr., King City.
Dolim, Steven Francis, Jr., Long Beach.
Dudley, Michael Banion, Los Angeles.
Durman, Charles Dudley, Santa Rosa.
Dougas, Johnnie Lee, San Francisco.
Douglas, Johnnie Lee, San Francisco.
Downs, Jack Dennis, Tujunga.
Drake, Richard Guy, Stockton.
Duarte, Gerald Michael, Campbell.
Duce, Roger L., Granada Hills.
Duffield, John David Lockwood, Ventura.
Duke, Alan Ray, Bakersfield.
Duncan, Roy William, Brawley.
Dunsing, Dennis Paul, Ukiah.
Duran, Juan Chaires, Jr., Los Angeles.
Duran, Pablo, Downey.
Dutra, Robert Leonard, San Diego.
Dyer, Dennis Earl, Taft.
Easton, John William, Anaheim.
Edgerton, Arthur Donald, Jr., Hayward.
Egolf, Klaus Dieter, Westminster.
Eisenbraun, William Forbes, Santa Ana.
Elgin, Robert Gerald, San Francisco.
Elia, Reese Currenti, Jr., Burbank.
Elkinton, Michael, Calistoga.
Ellsworth, James Oliver, Sacramento.
Ellsworth, Lawrence, Los Angeles.
Enbody, Michael Wiliam, Canoga Park.
England, Robert Blair, II, Whittier.
Engstrom, Loren Eugene, La Canada.
Erickson, Leonard Daniel, Livemore.
Ervin, Glen Otis, Placerville.
Escott, Kenneth Robert, Oakland.
Eskew, Ronnie Joe, Yuba City.
Esparza Malcolm Marcellin, San Fernando.
Estrada, Mario Pereda, Inglewood.
Estrada, Randolph Phillip, Los Angeles.
Estrada, Roy Lee, Lakeside.
Evans, Garfield, San Diego.

Everets, Dennis Lee, San Diego.
Farden, Kenneth Roy, Los Angeles.
Faulkner, Michael Anthony, Los Angeles.
Fay, Michael Andrew, Saugus.
Fay, Patrick Dennis, Cypress.
Fedoroff, Alexander, San Francisco.
Feigenbutz, Terrence R., Rialto.
Ferralez, Richard, Los Angeles.
Fielding, David Andrew, Santa Barbara.
Filippelli, John Mario, Hayward.
Finley, Leland Patrick, Huntington Beach.
Fleer, Robert Dean, Fullerton.
Fletcher, Kim William, Hollywood.
Flohr, George, Jr., Huntington Park.
Flores, Richard Javier, Hanford.
Fogg, Albert Randolph III, Santa Maria.
Foster, Eddie Dale, Santa Maria.
Freedle, Frank Louie, Ft. Ord.
Frick, Edsall A., Petaluma.
Friend, Richard Allen, San Diego.
Fritsche, Robert, Jr., Stockton.
Fry, James Ray, Jr., Los Alamitos.
Fryer, Robert Risley, Paso Robles.
Fujimoto, Donald Shuichi, Stockton.
Fuller, Carroll Bruce, Sunnyvale.
Fuller, Dennis Earl, Santa Fe Springs.
Fuller, Stanley Carl, Fullerton.
Gabriel, Meredith Alton, San Diego.
Gaftunik, Steven John, Sacramento.
Gallo, Peter Joseph, Livingston.
Galvez, Joe Angel, Oakland.
Garcia, Isaac Ramirez, Jr., San Fernando.
Garnica, Andy, Richmond.
Garver, Phillip Eugene, Calimesa.
Gatewood, Gerald Peter, Fresno.
Gau, Louis Ellie, Los Altos Hills.
Gerome Michael Anthony, Reseda.
Geyer, Leroy Clyde, Hayward.
Gibbins, Robert Wayne, Merced.
Glaspie, William Harold, Fresno.
Godwin, James R., Sacramento.
Golden, John Michael, Westminster.
Goldsmith, Daniel Eric, Farmersville.
Gomez, Andres Armando R., Anaheim.
Gonzales, Paul Alfred, Richmond.
Gonzalez, Albert, Hollister.
Gonzalez, Carlos, Hamilton City.
Gonzalez, Joaquin Christop, Redondo Beach.
Gonzalez, Richard, Bakersfield.
Gorsich, James Tony, Yorba Linda.
Gotcher, Larrie Jack, Citrus Heights.
Goudelock, William Roger, Meridian.
Granados, Richard, Merced.
Grant, Willie, Jr., Los Angeles.
Gravel, Bobby Joe, Lawndale.
Gray, Warren, Inglewood.
Green, Donald Edward, Compton.
Griffith, William Chapin, Seaside.
Grigsby, Barry N., Redding.
Guard, Martin William, Santa Ana.
Guardado, Daniel, Santa Ana.
Guarienti, Ralph, Sacramento.
Guerra-Hernandez, Rene, Los Angeles.
Guerrero, Richard Joseph, Los Angeles.
Guest, Raymond Calvin, Redding.
Guillen, Phillip O., San Jose.
Gulie, James Patrick, San Diego.
Guzman, Juan Araujo, Artesia.
Gwinn, Michael James, Redding.
Haas, Frederick William, Santa Rosa.
Hadley, Joseph Austin, Santa Rosa.
Hadzega, George Stephen, Santa Ana.
Hammer, Robert Ralph, San Jose.
Hammett, Richard Lee, San Leandro.
Harano, Allen Hideo, Berkeley.
Harbour, Thomas James, Auburn.
Hardesty, Robert Warren, Santa Clara.
Harding, Warren Guthrie, Jr., Westminster.
Hardman, James Allen, San Leandro.
Hare, Michael Kenneth, Covina.
Harris, Robert Earl, San Jose.
Haugen, Alan Robert, Grass Valley.
Havel, Richard Thomas, Atwater.
Hayes, Dan David, San Jose.
Hederman, Patrick Shawn, Chino.
Heeren, Darrel Wayne, Maywood.
Hefner, Francis Joe, Vallejo.
Heil, Richard Edwards, Lodi.
Heintz, Wayne Douglas, Elk Grove.
Heller, Robert Lee, Long Beach.
Hellman, Kenneth Raymond, San Mateo.
Henry, Robert Gregory, San Diego.
Henry, Scott D., Anaheim.
Herd, Thomas Leon, Modesto.
Hermanson, Stephen Mark, Carmel Valley.
Hernandez, Ramon S., Jr., Calexico.
Hernandez, Rene Zarogoza, San Gabriel.
Hernandez, Victor Reyes, Fullerton.
Hess, Robert Jay, Sacramento.
Hewitson, Paul Crawford, Yucca Valley.
Hicks, Eugene Stanley, Arcadia.
Hicks, Steven Gary, Napa.
Higgins, Patrick Albert, Porterville.
Hill, Dale Evans, Paradise.
Hill, Peter Alan, Eureka.
Hill, Randall Steven, Lynwood.
Hinkston, Robert Francis, San Jose.
Hoadley, Gary Ellis, Fontana.
Hofer, Russell Gene, Camarillo.
Hogan, Kraig Sewell, Sunnyvale.
Holcombe, Thomas Marvin, San Diego.
Holland, Luey Vernon, Riverside.
Holton, Gary Dennis, Chico.
Hood, Ernest Ervin, Compton.
Horner, Carl Nicholas M., San Bernardino.
Hursley, Richard Wayne, Westminster.
Hourigan, Michael Patrick, Santa Rosa.
Huff, Robert Randel, Baldwin Park.
Hughes, Brian Gregory, Whittier.
Hughes, Samuel Rueben, Los Angeles.
Hughes, Thomas Gilbert, Oakland.
Hulse, Gary Wayne, Paramount.
Humphrey, Jarold Edward, Greenville.
Humphrey, Weden Gary, Camarillo.
Hunt, Hood Hal, Encino.
Hupe, Russell Edward, Los Angeles.
Hurtado, John Bernard, Sanger.
Hustead, Terence Michael, Moraga.
Hutchinson, Robert S. II., Hacienda Heights.
Ide, Ben Hervey, Marina.
Ilman, William Steve, Oreville.
Imbach, John, III., Carpinteria.
Iniguez, Dennis Glenn, San Diego.
Irwin, Van Allen, Northridge.
Ishman, Albert Jr., Los Angeles.
Jackson, David Andrew, Tulare.
Jackson, Denny Milburn, Santa Paula.
Jackson, Little Jay, San Pablo.
Jackson, Paul Edward, Richmond.
Jacobs, Dennis Wayne, San Diego.
Jacobs, William John, Lancaster.
Jacobson, Warner Craig, Fresno.
Janowicz, Joseph Anthony, Huntington Park.
Jans, Robert Allen, San Jose.
Jansen, Jerome Eddie Wally, Vista.
Jarick, Russell William, Los Angeles.
Jeantet, Francis Leon, Fremont.
Jensen, Douglas Gary, North Hollywood.
Jernberg, Robert Stevens, San Jose.
Jessiman, Thad Bazily, Castro Valley.
Jimenez, Isidro Briceno, San Gabriel.
Johnson, Anthony Eric, San Francisco.
Johnson, Larry Lee, Anaheim.
Johnson, Larry Ray, Buttonwillow.
Johnson, Robert William, Jr., Sacramento.
Johnston, Robert Earl, Jr., Alameda.
Johnston, Tommy Wayne, Bellflower.
Jones, James Lester, Lancaster.
Jones, Randolph Robert, Bakersfield.
Jordan, Stephen Alan, Monrovia.
Joseph, Michael Arnold, Sacramento.
Kamrath, Jack Harlan, Sacramento.
Kandler, Terrence Arthur, Torrance.
Kaski, Donald Albert, Fortuna.
Kaye, Mark Samuel, Studio City.
Keller, James Louis, Visalia.
Kelley, David Bruce, Los Angeles.
Kelly, Dennis Leroy, Redondo Beach.
Kelly, Larry Lee, Hayward.
Keyes, Daniel Duane, San Jose.
Kim, Harry, San Diego.
Kincannon, Raymond Omer, Chula Vista.
Kindred, Michael George, San Jose.
King, Gilbert, Los Angeles.
King, Norton Zigmund, San Diego.
Kingman, Barry Dean, Palo Alto.
Kinnard, William Lloyd, Hesperia.
Kirk, Melvin Lynn, Clovis.
Klein, Michael Kenneth, Sacramento.
Klenske, Howard Lee, Burbank.
Kline, Harvey Edward, II, San Diego.
Kline, Robert Francis, Jr., Los Altos.
Klotz, John Robert, Crescent City.
Kotyluk, Kenneth Eugene, Sacramento.
Krause, Manfred Walter, San Diego.
Krech, Steven Dennis, Riverside.
Krill, Russell Walter, San Jose.
Kuchinski, Ralph Warren, Sacramento.
Kuntz, Gene Ray, Murphys.
La Grou, Raymond Louis, Jr., Santa Monica.
La Roche, Joel Mitchell, Huntington Beach.
La Rochelle, Marcel Adelar, Buena Park.
Lackey, Robert Edgar, Mount Laguna.
Laframboise, Phillip Dougl, La Mesa.
Laika, Fagal, II, Azusa.
Laine, Wayne Kevin, Walnut Creek.
Laird, Patrick Steven, Castro Valley.
Lalich, David Hugh, West Covina.
Lamb, Thomas Robert, Los Angeles.
Landers, Edmond John, Vacaville.
Landers, Richard Ray, Orcutt.
Landon, Gary Joseph, Yreka.
Lane, Dennis Eugene, Wilton.
Lane, Richard Arthur, Fontana.
Lara, Apimenio, Upland.
Lara, Larry Caluistus, Santa Barbara.
Laster, Alvin Mack, Jr., Compton.
Lau, Hoi Tin, Pasadena.
Lavigne, Gerald Andre, Woodland Hills.
Lawson, William Charles, Happy Camp.
Le Blanc, Floy Feleipe Este, San Francisco.
Le Desma, Lour, Visalia.
Leach, Dickie Lynn, Alameda.
Lee, Donald Gerald, Morro Bay.
Lehr, David Richard, San Rafael.
Leon, Guerrero Kinny San, Hayward.
Licea, Francisco Xavier, Los Angeles.
Liebespeck, James Warren, La Puente.
Lilley, David Rose, Dinuba.
Lindel, John Richard, Garden Grove.
Lipsius, Michael Glenn, Santa Clara.
Long, Hal Randolph, North Hollywood.
Loomis, Billie Clifford, Palermo.
Lopez, Edward, San Bernardino.
Lopez, Frederick George, Manteca.
Lopez, Jose de Jesus, Soledad.
Lopez-Ramos, Luis Alfonso, Calexico.
Lorenzo, Robert J., Colusa.
Losel, Fred George, Jr., La Puente.
Loveland, Ronald Ray, Sunnyvale.
Lozano, Donald James, Fresno.
Luallin, Lee Andres, Oakland.
Lucas, Herbert George, Brawley.
Lucas, Karl, Redondo Beach.
Lucas, Phillip Warren, Los Angeles.
Luna, Robert, Alameda.
Lutge, Thomas Albert, San Francisco.
Mabrey, Gary Michiel, Berkeley.
MacIntosh, Donald Gordon, El Sobrante.
MacManus, James Francis, Anaheim.
Madeuga, Manuel Dominic, Modesto.
Madrigal-Cordero, R. A., Jr., Los Angeles.
Maestas, Gilbert Merill, San Diego.
Mailloux, Earl Adelbert, Oakland.
Makuh, Frank Joseph, Placentia.
Malone, James Edgar, Inglewood.
Mangan, Michael Robert, Costa Mesa.
Manowski, Edward, Rowland Heights.
Marcello, John Bernard, Los Angeles.
Markusen, Tobias Earl,, Long Barn.
Markwell, Eugene Lynn, Torrance.
Marland, Innes Lee, Long Beach.
Marlowe, Jack William, Gilroy.
Marrufo, Rodney Elmer, Jr., Stewarts Point.
Martin, Ernest Tyrone, Compton.
Martin, Freddie Kay, Hollywood.
Martin, Gerald, Chula Vista.
Martin, John Major, Fresno.
Martin, Kenneth Leroy, Los Angeles.
Martin, Michael Emmett, Los Angeles.
Martin, Richard Jody, Carlotta.
Martin, Thomas Charles, Torrance.
Martinsen, Loren Daune, Red Bluff.
Martz, Melvin Lee, Paramount.
Masteller, Allan Dean, Chico.
Matinez, Steven Catarino, Venice.
Mattson, Kenneth Eugene, Lafayette.
Mauldin, Eddie Lee, Los Angeles.
May, James, Jr., Oakland.
May, Roy Edward, Sacramento.
Mazza, Stephen Darrell, Carmichael.

McAfee, Clyde Richard, San Diego.
McCloyn, Joseph, Los Angeles.
McCoig, Donald B., Ventura.
McCollum, David Vernon, Huntington Park.
McConnell, William Walker, Sonora.
McDaniel, Richard Byers, San Mateo.
McDavid, William Earl, Ontario.
McDougal, Billy Dean, Winton.
McEuen, Ronald Curtis, Garden Grove.
McFall, Gary Richard, Northridge.
McFarland, Louis Henry, Santa Barbara.
McGehee, John Albert, San Jose.
McInnis, Theodore Valenti, Oakland.
McIntyre, Duncan B., Greenville.
McJimsey, William Robert, Oakland.
McKechnie, Daniel Lee, Concord.
McKee, Jack Roger, Needles.
McKinnon, Jack Wiley, Jr., Santa Cruz.
McKinsey, Gerald Leroy, Jr., Modesto.
McMahon, Douglas Duane, Sherman Oaks.
McMurphy, Jay Darrell, Vallejo.
McNearney, Patrick Victor, Oakland.
Mebust, Owen Edward, Manhattan Beach.
Meek, Thomas Otis, Los Angeles.
Mena, Joseph Angel, City of Commerce.
Mendibles, Raymond G., Norwalk.
Mendoza, John Dee, South Gate.
Mendoza, Martin Elby, Los Angeles.
Mendoza, Peter Acosta, Union City.
Mercke, Terrance Lee, Long Beach.
Mericantante, Thomas Lee, Solana Beach.
Mesa, James Gregory, Jamul.
Messerli, Steven Louis, Norwalk.
Miller, Glenn Edwin, Oakland.
Miller, Michael, Jr., La Mesa.
Miller, Robert Gail, San Jose.
Mills, John Paul, Sebastopol.
Minko, Michael Anthony, Culver City.
Miranda, Joe Aleman, Bakersfield.
Mitchell, Michael Jeffrey, San Esteban.
Montague, Stephen Griffith, Redwood City.
Montgomery, George Wesley, Sacramento.
Montgomery, Michael Mallor, Visalia.
Moore, Charles Edward, Jr., Moorpark.
Moore, Glenn Douglas, Castro Valley.
Moore, Jimmy Ray, San Francisco.
Moore, Larry Jay, Exeter.
Moore, Lester Lewis, La Mirada.
Moore, Robert Ned, Anaheim.
Mora, Ernest Lopez, Fresno.
Mora, Ramiro Michael, South San Gabriel.
Moreno, Adolfo Valenzuela, Artesia.
Mori, Bruce Jun, Los Angeles.
Morris, Lyle Wayne, Ferndale.
Morris, Thomas W., Hayward.
Morrison, Glen Mark, Dale City.
Morrow, Dale Arthur, Paramount.
Mosseau, Lloyd Francis, Cudahy.
Muller, Harold Bradley, McKinleyville.
Multhaupt, James Wayne, Los Angeles.
Munatones, Jose Jr., San Francisco.
Munoz, Carlos Garcia, San Jose.
Munoz, Larry, Torrance.
Murray, Bruce Anderson, Manhattan Beach.
Musselman, Donald L., Tulelake.
Myers, Ricky Alan, Napa.
Nash, James Robert, Davis.
Nastor, Tony Valdez, San Jose.
Naylor, Dennis Eugene, Orange.
Neal, Kenneth Lawrence, San Jose.
Neiswender, Daniel Lynn, South Laguna.
Nelson, Boyd Jeffery, Oxnard.
Nelson, Daniel Eugene, Jr., Barstow.
Nelson, John Edward, Sacramento.
Nelson, William De Witt, Long Beach.
Neubacher, Brandt Steele, Berkeley.
Newson, Leroy, Jr., Stockton.
Nickel, Warren F., Jr., Watsonville.
Nishizawa, Glenn Nobuyki, Los Angeles.
Noble, John Rodney, Van Nuys.
Nordquist, Gary Leigh, Paramount.
Nordstrom, Victor Carl, Encino.
Novakovich, Jerry A., Concord.
Numez, David Guerrero, Jr., Brawley.
Nusshaumer, Steve Owen, Hayward.
Nystrom, Thomas Allen, Anaheim.
O'Bannon, Albert F., Jr., Redlands.
O'Brien, Richard Conaway, Santa Barbara.
O'Connor, Dennis Kenneth, San Francisco.
Ogami, Terry Y., Reedley.
Oglesby, John R., Tustin.
Ohara, Steve Masao, San Jose.
Ohlson, Galen Erick, Modesto.
Olivares-Martinez, Arturo, Ventura.
Oliver, Paul Harold, Alameda.
Oliveras, Rudy Michael, Colton.
Olson, Robert Gray, Inglewood.
Omstead, David King, Costa Mesa.
Ornelas-Arellano Victor M., Escondido.
Ortega, Frank Dennis, Saugus.
Oster, Frank Allen, Taft.
Owen, Robert Gary, Gasquet.
Ozanne, Jordan Jay, Pacoima.
Pagcaliuagan, Ceizhar Vale, San Francisco.
Page, Luther, Jr., San Francisco.
Palacio, Raymond Jesus, Seaside.
Panamaroff, Walter John, Lompoc.
Parmeter, Gerald Thomas, Cazadero.
Partida, Charlie Lopez, Chino.
Pasillas, Henry, Riverside.
Patterson, Larry Hart, Gridley.
Paulk, Robert Milton, Vallejo.
Pearce, Marvin Robert, Capitola.
Pedrick, Charles C. II, Alameda.
Peguero, Richard, Los Angeles.
Pellicano, Jean Pierre V., Alameda.
Pendergraft, Ronnie Dean, Clovis.
Perez, Joseph Espino, San Francisco.
Perez, Juan J., Selma.
Perez, Raymond Luna, San Joaquin.
Perez, Richard, Morgan Hill.
Perry, Donald Lee, Taft.
Perry, Steve Joseph Leone, La Honda.
Peterman, Thomas Howard, San Bernardino.
Peters, John Denis, Palo Alto.
Peters, Walter John, Indio.
Pettitt, Donald Ace, Bellflower.
Pickett, Wilton Ray, Santa Cruz.
Pimentel, Ronnie Cardoza, Clayton.
Pina, Frank David, Montclair.
Pittman, Robert Louis, Willowbreak.
Pogue, Michael Alan, Colusa.
Pohl, William Anthony, Los Angeles.
Pope, Thomas Robert, La Mirada.
Port, Gary Craig, San Rafael.
Poso, John Richard, San Jose.
Potts, Wilmer, Oakland.
Poulson, Bruce William, Corona Del Mar.
Powell, Daniel Lee, Artesia.
Powell, Reginald Foster, Empire.
Powell, Russell J., Redding.
Powers, Steven Charles, Compton.
Prescott, Dennis Louis, Sunnyvale.
Preston, Ross McClelan, La Habra.
Prien, Don, Palo Alto.
Priesthoff, John Howard II, Woodland Hills.
Prosky, Leveret Roscoe, Palm Springs.
Puffenbarger, William T., Oakland.
Pumphrey, Cornealus, Jr., Corcoran.
Purcell, Dennis Edward, Tulare.
Quezada, Arthur, Trona.
Rainford, Edward George, Santa Rosa.
Ramirez, Jesus P., Los Angeles.
Ramirez, Lorenzo, Jr., Los Angeles.
Randolph, Richard Alan, Sutter Creek.
Rasori, Carl Raymond, Los Angeles.
Rathmann, Eugene Le Roy, San Diego.
Ray, Darwin Esker, East Highlands.
Ray, Robert Breckenridge, Bakersfield.
Ray, William David, El Centro.
Reed, Dennis Dale, Palm Springs.
Reich, William Goodro, San Fernando.
Remillard, Garry Edward, Hayward.
Renteria, Rudolph Sotelo, San Jose.
Reyes, Robert Antonio, Richmond.
Reynolds, Michael Monroe, Anaheim.
Rezende, Daniel Dias, Concord.
Rich, Danny Kaye, Roseville.
Richardson, Gary Lyle, Red Bluff.
Richter, Jay Dee, Pasadena.
Rivera-Bermudez Jose Antonio, San Jose.
Rizzardini, Timothy Joseph, Ridgecrest.
Roark, Anund C., San Diego.
Roberts, Archie James, Jr., Corona.
Roberts, Clifford Joseph, Hacienda Heights.
Roberts, Kenneth Ray, Cupetino.
Roberts, Louis Wade, Los Angeles.
Robinson, Bruce Allen, Calimesa.
Rodgers, Gary Gene, San Francisco.
Rodgers, John Arlington, Fontana.
Rodrigues, Joseph Michael, Santa Rosa.
Rodriguez, Benito Bobo, Freedom.
Rodriguez, Jesse Emiterio, Cutler.
Rogers, Wayne Johnathen, Hanford.
Romo, Robert Allen, Rialto.
Rosar, Robert John, San Bernardino.
Rose, Michael Allen, San Pablo.
Rose, Nathaniel Robert, Los Angeles.
Rosenberger, David Arthur, Orange.
Ross, Gene K., Boron.
Rowe, James Gray, Jr., Davis.
Rowland, William Michael, Garden Grove.
Roy, James Willie III, Oroville.
Ruiz, Manuel, La Puente.
Ruiz, Ramon Rodriguez, Santa Clara.
Russell, Gregory Allen, Rio Linda.
Russell, Richard Shannon, Santa Ana.
Ryan, Bernard Steven, Hollywood.
Rye, Dillard Gale, Dos Palos.
Rygg, Charles Allen, Oakland.
Sabo, Larry Michael, Turlock.
Sanchez, Ralph Jr., Los Angeles.
Sandoval, Daniel Flore, Compton.
Sandoval, Louie Joe, Oakland.
Sandvig, Vernon Dale, Los Banos.
Sanford, Henry Charles, Jr., Parma.
Santos, Joseph, Sacramento.
Santos, Michael Eugene, Monterey Park.
Sapinosa, Alfred Robert, Santa Maria.
Scales, Astor Jr., Los Angeles.
Scalise, Edward Joseph, Palo Alto.
Scharosch, Patrick Francis, Garden Grove.
Schasre, David M., Santa Ana.
Schmidt, Steven Warren, Anaheim.
Schroeder, Nicholas Lee, Eagle Mountain.
Schroeder, Stanley A., Los Angeles.
Schultz, Edward August, San Luis Obispo.
Schuyler, Ronald Lee, Hermosa Beach.
Schwartz, Kenneth Dale, Paso Robles.
Seavey, Douglas Rex, Highland.
Sebens, Gaylord James, Riverside.
Sehi, George Stephen, Lynwood.
Serrano, Gilbert, San Jose.
Serrano, Rodolfo Carrillo, Soledad.
Serrem, Mark MacDonald, Carmel.
Shannon, Kenneth Michael, Santa Clara.
Sharp, David Jackson, Sacramento.
Sharpless, Robert Leon, Santa Rosa.
Sheahan, Michael David, Tujunga.
Shelton, Edward Minot, Jr., Pasadena.
Sherman, Roosevelt Jr., Long Beach.
Shields, David Thomas, Sacramento.
Showers, Dennis Karl, Fair Oaks.
Shreve, Joseph Lynwood, Jr., Newark.
Shumate Berlin Robert, Hayward
Silveira, Jose A. C., Turlock.
Simmonds, Jerry Lee, Sacramento.
Sims, Jerry G., Novato.
Sisco, Jerry Donald, Jr., Ballico.
Skakel, George Walter, Santa Cruz.
Smart, Lester Edward, Jr., King City.
Smevold, Emil Harold, Daly City.
Smiley, William Thomas, Fresno.
Smith, Benny James, Brawley.
Smith, Charles Lenet, San Jose.
Smith, Donald James, San Francisco.
Smith, James Douglas, San Jose.
Smith, Jesse Lee, Los Angeles.
Smith, Larry Michael, Glendora.
Smith, Paul Leslie, Stockton.
Smith, Paul Wesley, Ordville.
Smith, Philip, Jr., Bell.
Smith, Thomas Lloyd, Durham.
Smith, Tullie Roscoe, Jr., Los Angeles.
Snell, Esmond Emerson, Jr., Berkeley.
Snyder, Bobby Clyde, Sacramento.
Solis, Eusebio, San Jose.
Soliz, Enrique Lorenzo, Stockton.
Sommers, Larry Eugene, Aptos.
Sommers, Steven Allen, Buena Park.
Sonstein, Paul Phillip, Pleasant Hill.
Sorenson, Eugene A., Los Angeles.
Sorick, Steven Paul, Cypress.
Soto, Arthur Ologue, Selma.
Soutar, Walter Jack, Compton.
Spafford, Galon Gene, Hawthorne.
Sparks, James Edward, Los Angeles.
Spotwood, Frank, Jr., San Francisco.
Stack, Joseph Vincent, Baldwin Park.
Stading, Gary Alan, Orange.
Stampfli, Theodore Arthur, Susanville.

Stapleton, Ollie Ray, Concord.
Stark, Coy Foster, Hughson.
Starkey, James Wayne, Campbell.
Steele, Walter Charles, San Diego.
Stephens, Roger Dean, Manhattan Beach.
Stevenson, Gary George, La Mirada.
Stevenson, John Raymond, Garden Grove.
Stewart, Leland, Monrovia.
Stewart, Lonny Lawrence, Norwalk.
Stewart, Robert Lee, Woodland.
Stewart, Samuel Kay, San Diego.
Stickler, Clark D., Orland.
Stidham, Ernest James, Carmichael.
Stone, William Earl, Fellows.
Stover, Tommy Gene, Wilmington.
Stratt, Jacob F., III, Santa Maria.
Strock, Charles Frederick, Santee.
Stuckey, Walter, Los Angeles.
Stutz, Brad John, Loma Linda.
Suiaunoa, Tuioalele T., Oceanside.
Sundell, Lars Peder, Belmont.
Sutton, Dennis Lee, Vallejo.
Swaim, Allan Gregory, Tustin.
Swanson, Keith Lyle, San Leandro.
Swanson, Todd Earle, Los Angeles.
Tabet, Henry Marsial, Compton.
Tafoya, Joseph Ernest, Lathrop.
Tappan, Frederick Howard, Mountain View.
Taylor, Herman L., San Diego.
Taylor, Richard Kenneth, Los Gatos.
Taylor, William Douglas, Compton.
Tebbetts, Terry Lee, Huntington Beach.
Theurkauf, Harry Lee, Grass Valley.
Thomas, Andrew Jackson, Oakland.
Thomas, John Raymond, Pacific Grove.
Thomas, Tim, Hawthorne.
Thomas, William Dewayne, Fremont.
Thompson, Bernard David, Jr., Los Angeles.
Thompson, Charles Clair, Bellflower.
Thompson, Dennis Eugene, Pittsburg.
Thompson, Kendall William, Piedmont.
Thompson, Robert R., Hanford.
Thompson, Walter Lee, Fresno.
Thonues, Guenter Robert, Burbank.
Thornton, David Leslie, Nation City.
Thorpe, Dennis Ray, Fullerton.
Timboe, Arthur Richard, San Francisco.
Timothy, Wayne Elliott, Tranquillity.
Tolette, Richard Ross, Pomona.
Tolparoff, Alex Robert, Los Angeles.
Tomkins, John Michael, Panorama City.
Torliatt, Charles Peter, Jr., Petaluma.
Torres, Arcadio Jr., Hollister.
Tortorici, Bruce, Van Nuys.
Townsend, Stephen Lance, Calistoga.
Townsend, William Paul, Jr., Reseda.
Trisler, Richard Lee, San Jose.
Trivelpiece, Steve Maurice, Stockton.
Trombetta, Tony, Sacramento.
Turner, Eugene, Los Angeles.
Turner, Jeffrey Arthur, Mill Valley.
Twitty, Daniel Ray, Sacramento.
Twyford, Thomas Lionel, Grover City.
Tyes, Robert Lee, San Francisco.
Underwood, William Henry J., Monterey.
Uyesaka, Robert Joseph, Santa Barbara.
Valdez, Alfred, Gilroy.
Valenzuela, Henry, Jr., San Gabriel.
Valenzuela, Oscar, Jr., Oakland.
Van Fleet, Donald William, Inglewood.
Van Hook, James Douglas, Richmond.
Van Horn, Barry William, Los Alamitos.
Vantol, Gary Leon, Ripon.
Varni, Howard Steven, Los Angeles.
Vasquez, Charles V., Jr., Los Angeles.
Vaughn, Donald Wilbanks, Ventura.
Vazquez, William, Huntington Beach.
Velasco, Mike Ralph, Los Angeles.
Veloz, Eduardo, Pacoima.
Vieras, Jose Louis, San Jose.
Villalpando, Raymond, Jr., Sacramento.
Villarosa, Paul Herman, Lake Tahoe.
Villegas, Daniel John, Pacoima.
Vines, Richard Larry, Bakersfield
Vinge, Terry Lee, Ventura.
Vinter, Steven Charles, Sacramento.
Volke, Clifford James, II, Culver City.
Vossen, Stanley Joseph, Inglewood.
Wagner, David Frederick, Adelanto.
Walber, Runald James, Nevada City.
Walker, Clifford Wayne, Mt. View.
Walker, George Thomas Lloy, Los Angeles.
Walker, James Edward, Jr., Pacifica.
Walker, Michael Frederick, Chico.
Walker, Thomas Michael, Richmond.
Wanbaugh, Ronald Nelson, Torrance.
Ward, Danny Edward, Downey.
Ware, Keith Lincoln, Los Angeles.
Watkins, David Eugene, Los Alamitos.
Watson, Ronald R., Santa Ana.
Watson, Stanley Eugene, Anderson.
Watts, Thomas Roger, Los Angeles.
Waysack, William John, Orange.
Weathersbee, Ernest Murral, Sacramento.
Weaver, Richard Allen, Woodland Hills.
Webb, Donald Ray, Grass Valley.
Weber, Raymon N., Livermore.
Weddendorf, Robert George, Inglewood.
Weiss, Raymond Douglas, Garden Grove.
Wenban, Bruce R., Redondo Beach.
Werner, Stuart Arthur, Sacramento.
Werner, Wallace Bruce, Sacramento.
Weske, Richard Alwine, Camarillo.
Wesolowski, Alvin John, Jr., Cupertino.
West, Bobby, Orange.
West, Robert Wilks, Huntington Beach.
Whaley, Loy Neal, Sacramento.
Wheeler, Darrell Eugene, Live Oak.
Whelan, Michael Patrick, San Francisco.
White, John Herbert, Jr., Anaheim.
White, Leunard Ray, Watsonville.
White, Ralph Eric, Compton.
Whorton, Dwayne Jefferson, McKinleyville.
Will, Frederick Reed, Whittier.
Williams, David Charles, San Francisco.
Williams, Gerald Patrick, Oakland.
Williams, Richard D., San Bernardino.
Williams, Thomas Howard, Torrance.
Wilson, Jack Pyeatt, Jr., Burbank.
Wilson, James David, Richvale.
Wilson, Kenneth Richard, Los Angeles.
Wilson, Ronald Alton, Oakland.
Wilton, Stanley Frank, Sacramento.
Wiltse, Ronald Ellis, Fontana.
Wisham, George Merritt, Jr., Bakersfield.
Witherell, Gary Lee, Compton.
Wittler, Larry Eldon, Petaluma.
Wood, Peter Lorenz, South Pasadena.
Wright, Jerry Dean, Garden Grove.
Yamane, Benji, Oakland.
Yamashita,Kenji Jerry, Sanger.
Ybarra, Kenneth Francis, Gardena.
Young, Daryel Joe, Ontario.
Young, Ernest Harold, III, Downey.
Young, Gary Lee, Los Angeles.
Young, James Paul, Walnut Creek.
Young, Jon Michael, San Luis Obispo.
Youngblood, William Ronald, Bakersfield.
Zager, Edward Arthur, Arcadia.
Zamora, Edward, Selma.
Zenick, Robert James, Glendale.
Zimmerman, Edward Anthony, Long Beach.
Zuniga, Joseph Anthony, Los Angeles.

Air Force

Berry, Ralph Thomas, Escondido.
Ciarfeo, Glenn Thomas, Los Angeles.
Clanton, Larry Jack, Cupertino.
Conlin, Jeffrey Francis, San Diego.
Cunningham, George Michael, Santa Monica.
Forshey, Robert Ernest, Canoga Park.
Kawamura, Robert Kiyoshi, Santa Clara.
Kopfer, John Jerome, Redwood City.
Lede, Roy Leo, San Francisco.
Maisey, Reginald Victor, Jr., Sonoma.
McKinstray, James J.. Jr., Oakland.
Moreland, Stephen Craig, Los Angeles.
Quill, Edward Beeding, Jr., San Francisco.
Ramsey, Richard Charles, Sun Valley.
Russell, Richard Lee, San Diego.
Stevens, John Bradford, Long Beach.
Wensinger, Ralph Robert, San Mateo.
Worley, Robert Franklin, Riverside.

Marine Corps

Adame, Gilbert Jimmie, Colton.
Adams, Ricky Fay, Baldwin Park.
Adams, William Ernest, Whispering Pines.
Alencastre, Anthony Albert, Concord.
Allen, Joseph Harold, Coalinga.
Amescua, Steven Epefanio, Turlock.
Anderson, Robert Eugene, Hayward.
Appleby, Rickey Eugene, Gardena.
Asuncion, Henry France, Delano.
Aikinson, Jerry Doyle, Lawndale.
Austin, Stephen Edward, Denair.
Ayala, Gilbert, Jr., Fresno.
Baker, Steven Dewitt, Santa Ana.
Baker, Tony Anderson, San Francisco.
Balades, David Zavala, Oxnard.
Banner, Steve Arthur, Los Angeles.
Barber, David Edwin, Hayward.
Barnes, Walter Frasier, San Bernardino.
Bates, James Edward, Redding.
Bath, Eldridge Jack, Richmond.
Berry, Michael George, Sunnyvale.
Berry, Roy Vernon, Jr., San Joaquin.
Biber, Joseph Frank, Lompoc.
Bickle, Jimbob, Helendale.
Binns, David Richard, Reseda.
Blagdon, Edwin Ellis, Auburn.
Blair, Rocky Lee, Long Beach.
Blevins, Anthony James, Turlock.
Bocanegra, Felix Ramon, Venice.
Boggs, Clifford Allen, Casitas Springs.
Boomsma, Roger Allen, Arcadia.
Boyd, Bradley Monroe, La Puente.
Breck, Gary Anthony, Santa Barbara.
Brewer, George Henry, Sacramento.
Briggs, Thomas Harold C., Santa Barbara.
Britton, Sherrick Camden, Daly City.
Brodrick, Steven Parker, Selma.
Brown, Ronald Howard, Sun Valley.
Bruckner, Patrick Louis, Reseda.
Brunner, O. D., San Diego.
Bunch, Raymond Lee, Jr., Ojai.
Buss, Ronald Frank, Los Angeles.
Bustamante, Arthur, San Fernando.
Bustamante, Stanley R., Jr., Los Angeles.
Butler, Larry Don, Buena Park.
Byrd, Charles, San Jose.
Cabano, George Angelo, Jr., Pacifica.
Calabiz, John Rosalez, Valinda.
Camp, William Gordon, Fresno.
Candelas, John Frank, Reedley.
Carbajal, Carlos Guzman, Chula Vista.
Cardenas, Daniel, Jr., Fullerton.
Carney, Tyrone Edward, Oakland.
Carpenter, Gary Ralph, Watsonville.
Carrillo, Richard, Los Angeles.
Carter, Thomas Lee, Reseda.
Casares, Manuel, Tehachapi,
Catron, Garry Wayne, Chester.
Chaney, Norman J., Lynwood.
Choate, Randall Bingham, Concord.
Chrisman, Rex Gordon, San Diego.
Chute, Stephen Forrest, Carmichael.
Claire, Kenneth William, Redwood City.
Clark, Lonnie Warren, Vallejo.
Clark, Stephen William, Plymouth.
Clark, Willie C., Los Angeles.
Coats, Charles Alex, Broderick.
Cole, Sam, Jr., San Francisco.
Comacho, Peter Frank, Jr., Santa Ana.
Conley, Robert Frank, Santa Ana.
Contreras, John Jenaro, Carpinteria.
Coomer, Richard Ross, Placentia.
Cooper, Donald Nathaniel, Big Bear Lake.
Cottrell, Thomas Lee, Los Gatos.
Courtemanche, Callen James, La Crescenta.
Crandall, Timothy Allen, Santa Barbara.
Crawford, James Patrick, Fullerton.
Croke, Robert Stanley, Walnut Creek.
Crow, Charles Curtis, Bakersfield.
Cruz, Pete Frank, Chualar.
Cummins, Lanny Dee, Oroville.
Davis, Carlos Ray, Tustin.
Dearing, Jerry Wayne, Lakewood.
Delgado, John Pedro, Sanger.
Devers, Leslie Allen, Jr., Riverside.
Diefenderfer, Thomas Edwar, Santa Clara.
Diggs, John Francis, Atherton.
Dryer, Richard Eugene, Norwalk.
Duffey, Gerald Thomas, Castro Valley.
Duhe, Byrun Randall, Fountain Valley.
Dyer, David Wayne, Arroyo Grande.
Dyer, Frederick Lee, Upland.
Edgar, Terrece Eugene, Oildale.
Eisenacher, Charles John, Torrance.
Enedy, Robert John, San Diego.
Escobar, Jesus Gutierrez, Wilmington.
Escobedo, Daniel, Fremont.
Esponoza, Mike Patricio, Fresno.
Eversull, Anthony Patrick, Torrance.

Ewing, Lon Barry, Chula Vista.
Fanua, Fiapai, Jr., Wilmington.
Ferguson, William Boyd, Sanger.
Ferrari, Arnold Jay, Napa.
Figueroa, Javier Puentes, Wilmington.
Filipiak, Peter Jan, La Puente.
Fix, William Leroy, San Diego.
Fleming, Bernard John, Riverside.
Flores, Felix Frank, Los Angeles.
Flores, Monico, Jr., Hacienda Heights.
Frisbee, Dennis Wayne, Oakland.
Garcia, Angel Antonio, Canoga Park.
Garcia, Christopher, Oceanside.
Garcia, Jerome, Sacramento.
Garcia, Marcial Boncoc, San Francisco.
Garcia, Raymond Ignacio, Hayward.
Garrett, Michael Sheridan, Santa Susana.
Garringer, David Frank, San Francisco.
Gay, Lonnie James, Bakersfield.
Gaynor, James Thomas, Fallbrook.
Gero, John Anthony, Burbank.
Gillaspy, Edward Andrew, La Habra.
Gipson, Ricky Duane, Pacoima.
Goetsch, Wayne August, Brentwood.
Gumez, Lambert Anselmu, Los Angeles.
Gomez, Manuel Joseph, Vallejo.
Gonzales, Joe Julian, La Puente.
Gonzales, Richard Castillo, Los Angeles.
Gonzalez, Robert Espinoza, Fresno.
Gore, David Edward, Manteca.
Gorton, Jack Burt, Culver City.
Gosch, Thomas Charles, Oceanside.
Grady, Jerry Edward, Alameda.
Greene, Robert Earl, Los Angeles.
Gregorius, George, Stockton.
Gross, James David, Pittsburg.
Gurwitz, Leonard Zachary, Costa Mesa.
Hagel, Richard William, Hayward.
Haley, Harrison Leroy, Martinez.
Hall, Richard David, Whittier.
Hamby, Clyde Randall, Hayward.
Hansen, Willam James, Atascadero.
Hardy, Jerry Ray, Long Beach.
Harty, David Lewis, Sacramento.
Haskell, Charles Wesley, Sacramento.
Hatch, Richard Lee, Bakersfield.
Hausrath, Donald Arthur, Jr., Villa Park.
Hawes, Robert Carlbean, Los Angeles.
Hayes, Fred Joe, Walnut Creek.
Headley, Frank Eberley IV, Eureka.
Heflin, Glen Elden, San Jose.
Hempel, Barry Lee, Garden Grove.
Henrickson, Combly Hanibal, San Diego.
Henry, Francis Gilbert, Rolling Hills.
Hernandez, Julio Alfonso, Los Angeles.
Hernandez, Pedro Alexandro, Los Nietos.
Hernandez, Reyes C., Jr., Colton.
Himmer, Lawrence, Chula Vista.
Holzman, Michael William, Sepulveda.
Hopper, Larry Charles, Ontario.
Horridge, Frederick Raymon, Lomita.
Houston, John Davis, Jr., Los Angeles.
Huggans, Kenneth Richard, San Mateo.
Hunt, James Anthony, La Puente.
Hunter, Delon, Los Angeles.
Hutson, Michael Gale, Sepulveda.
Incrocci, Richard Lafayett, Madera.
Ingram, Ronald Ernest, Redwood City.
Inman, Phillip Lee, Hickman.
Ironside, Steven Paul, Vallejo.
Issenmann, Michael William, Santa Clara.
Jackson, Donald Gene, Lakeside.
Jackson, G. B., Jr., Santa Rosa.
Jackson, Nathaniel Harvey, Los Angeles.
Jackson, Robert Elee, Paramount.
Janeway, Jerry Lee, Delhi.
Jennings, Rudolph, San Francisco.
Johnson, George Stephen, West Covina.
Johnson, Gerald Lynn, Mojave.
Johnson, James Edward, San Diego.
Johnson, Kim Williams, Fresno.
Jones, David Russell, Spring Valley.
Jones, Donald Byron, Lynwood.
Jones, James Walter, Hawthorne.
Jones, Larry Allan, Thousand Oaks.
Jordan, Litael, Jr., Los Angeles.
Joyner, Stephen Douglass, La Habra.
Juarez, George Albert, Pico Rivera.
Kalb, Michael Dale, Campbell.
Kane, Michael, Canoga Park.
Kemski, Gary Douglas, North Hollywood.
Killgore, Gene Douglas, Blythe.
Kinsworthy, Loyd Eugene, San Jose.
Knevelbaard, Andy, Lakewood.
Komers, John George, El Monte.
Kralik, William John, Culver City.
Krueger, Lorne Coleman, El Monte.
Kurilick, Robert Vaso, Pasadena.
Kurtz, Christopher Landis, Long Beach.
Kuykendall, Henry Joseph, Los Angeles.
Lambert, Jeffrey Earl, Redding.
Langh, Thomas Earl, Los Angeles.
Langrock, Dennis Ray, Sacramento.
Lavelle, Patrick James, Pasadena.
Lawrence, Ernest Frederick, Walnut Creek.
Lee, Michael Duryes, Palo Alto.
Leeman, Robert Allan, Fullerton.
Leonard, Arnold Lee, Jr., Morgan Hill.
Lewis, Allen Wayne, Fremont.
Lewis, Ronald Keith, Monterey.
Lopez, Adrian Salome, San Martin.
Lopez, Armando, Los Angeles.
Lyons, Carl, Los Angeles.
Maddox, Richard Greene, Cupertino.
Maddox, Roy Raymond, Jr., Independence.
Mahoney, Ralph Martin, Port Chicago.
Mahoney, Thomas P., III, Oakland.
Maldonado, Anthony Gilbert, Los Angeles.
Malone, John Edward, San Diego.
Mamon, Cesar Jabonillo, San Jose.
Marken, John Paul, Jr., Escondido.
Marquez, Martin, Jr., Los Angeles.
Marshall, Charles Ray, Oakland.
Marshall, Willard Dale, La Jolla.
Martin Jeffrey Lea, Santa Ana.
Martinez, Ernesto, San Jose.
Martinez, George Vincent, San Francisco.
Masadas, Ben Obseniares, Pittsburg.
Maxam, Larry Leonard, Glendale.
McCabe, Marc Wayne, Menlo Park.
McCall, Allan Lee, San Bernardino.
McCants, Alfred Frazier, Fallbrook.
McCosar, Winford, Bell.
McDonald, D. Lance, Van Nuys.
McGinley, Gerald Greydon, Concord.
McKenzie, Douglas N., II, Oceanside.
McKenzie, Richard Wayne, Oxnard.
McLelland, Marvin Edward, Arcata.
Medeiros, Dennis Joseph, San Lorenzo.
Medina, Daniel Michael, San Diego.
Melville, Timothy James, Manhattan Beach.
Mendell, Allan, San Francisco.
Mendoza, Gilbert, El Monte.
Michael, Dennis Steven, Vacaville.
Miles, Dale Arthur, San Diego.
Misa, Viane Sufeni, Oceanside.
Moise, Herve Jean, Los Angeles.
Molossi, Robert John, Daly City.
Montano, Anthony, Los Angeles.
Moore, Elliott Wayne, Long Beach.
Morelos, Catarino, Jr., Sanger.
Moreno, John Bobby, Vallejo.
Mulgrew, Kevin Spear, Los Angeles.
Mullen, Joseph William, Jr., Torrance.
Muncy, Gilbert Howard, Long Beach.
Musick, Raymond Earl, Jr., Compton.
Najar, Adam Serna, Palm Springs.
Nash, David Eugene, National City.
Nelson, Donald Lawrence, Santa Susana.
Nelson, Willard Edward, Contra.
Newton, Leonard Lee, Stockton.
Nora, Raymond Vernon, Albany.
Nott, Byron Lee, Jr., Lawndale.
O'Bannon, Robert, III, San Bernardino.
O'Connor, John Vinson, Jr., Roseville.
Obregon, Raul Albert, Los Angeles.
Olsen, Steven Wayne, Sunset Beach.
Oropeza, Manuel Garcia, Los Angeles.
Orr, Raymond Franklin, Jr., Santa Cruz.
Ortiz, Arturo Marquez, Los Angeles.
Pacheco, Robert Lee, Los Olivos.
Padilla, Ralph Henry, Merced.
Page, John Arthur, San Diego.
Page, Michael Ransom, Sacramento.
Palacios, Luis Fernando, Los Angeles.
Palmquist, Steven Leonard, Kerman.
Paopao, Keila, San Francisco.
Parker, William Thomas, Stockton.
Patterson, Edward Leon, Garden Grove.
Payne, Andrew James, Jr., Glendale.
Pearson, Thomas Rickard, Jr., San Diego.
Phipps, James Alvin, Compton.
Pinales, Lawrence, San Pedro.
Pinatelli, Thomas Michael, Hawthorne.
Pinole, Babe, Santa Rosa.
Pitts, Terry Dennis, Bakersfield.
Planchon, Randall T. II, Long Beach.
Poffenbarger, William Osca, San Diego.
Poppa, Gerald Leland, Salinas.
Powers, Ronald Lee, Fresno.
Prock, Daniel Lee, Gridley.
Purcell, Gary William Torrance.
Purdie, Robert David, Sherman Oaks.
Rabey, Kenneth Tilden, Orange.
Railla, Jean Anthony, North Hollywood.
Ralph, Gary Ray, Campbell.
Ramos, George Michael, San Francisco.
Rasco, Kenneth Edward, Los Angeles.
Ratliff, Terry Dixon, Atascadero.
Reed, Roger Lee, Los Angeles.
Reyes, Ronald, La Puente.
Richee, James Burnus, Compton.
Riggs, Walter Roderick, Moorpark.
Riley, Ricky Vaughn, Compton.
Rinehart, James Dale, Jackson.
Ritchie, Douglas Reid, Whittier.
Robertson, Merle Eldon, Campbell.
Rogone, John Pio, Upland.
Roley, Herbert Wallace, Lakeside.
Romero, Joseph Michael, Lakewood.
Romero, Pedro, Jr., La Mirada.
Romero, Robert William, San Diego.
Rountree, Ronald Corbin, Sherman Oaks.
Ruchti, Heinz, Fairfield.
Ruiz, Andrew Andy, Clovis
Rush, Ervin Lee, Sacramento.
Rusher, Robert Charles, Tracy.
Ryan, Ronald Royce, Sacramento.
Sanchez, Edward, Jr., Los Angeles.
Sandoval George, Los Angeles.
Sapp, Wayne Leroy, Fallbrook.
Saunders, William O., Jr., Tulare.
Saxton, Gary Lee, Cathedral City.
Scarpinato, John Andrew, La Puente.
Scharff, Lennie Harold, Ben Lomond.
Schlamp, Gary Olin, Long Beach.
Schneller, Steven Owen, Marysville.
Schramm, Brock Rowland, San Carlos.
Schwartz, David Earl, Sacramento.
Scofield, John Charles, Anselmo.
Seaman, John Charles, Jr., Spring Valley.
Searles, Charles Peter, Burbank.
Shannon, Stephen Craig, Santa Monica.
Shelton, Henry Earl, North Hollywood.
Shelton, Robert Scott, Vacaville.
Shewman, Ronald James, Los Angeles.
Shields, Jimmy Lee, San Martin.
Siller, Peter Lenhart, Sacramento.
Silvers, Mitchell Frank, Norwalk.
Skaggs, Richard Allan, Cupertino.
Skinner, Herbert Kirk, Woodland Hills.
Skinner, Walter Francis, Soledad.
Smith, Frank John, Pico Rivera.
Smith, Marlin, Los Angeles.
Smith, Robert Carroll, Bell Gardens.
Sorchini, Andres, Los Angeles.
Soto, Martin Jesus, Compton.
Spaw, James Odis, Costa Mesa.
Stanley, Eural, Jr., Venice.
Stith, Daryl La Don, Hayward.
Stonesifer, Donald Lee, San Bernardino.
Storz, George William, San Anselmo.
Strobbe, Daniel Edwin, San Jose.
Strong, Gridley Barstow, Ontario.
Strong, Stanley Grant, Covina.
Sugiura, Tom Dennis, Moneterey Park.
Sullivan, Richard D. Jr., Redondo Beach.
Talley, Gary Lee, Campbell.
Taylor, Albert Russell, Springville.
Taylor, Geoffrey Raymond, Canoga Park.
Teague, Bruce Edward, Canoga Park.
Tharaldson, Jeffrey Ray, Sacramento.
Thomas, Charles Blake, Cucamonga.
Thomas, Michael Edward, Canoga Park.
Thompson, Louis Kenneth, Fremont.
Thornton, William A., Jr., Lawndale.
Tice, Gary Dale, Santa Clara.
Tisdall, Gary Dean, Modesto.
Toia, Matau, Jr., San Francisco.
Tolentino, Clarence, San Luis Rey.
Tomlinson, David Marlow, Cypress.
Torres, Manuel Prieto, Piru.

Toyias, Charles Leslie, Long Beach.
Trantham, Donald Ray, Santa Clara.
Trimble, James Mitchell, Eureka.
Turk, John Geoffrey, Lomita.
Turner, David Robert, Walnut Creek.
Tyler, Larry Josh, Los Angeles.
Valdez, Ismael Jose, Jr., Pico Rivera.
Valstad, Clyde Julius, San Diego.
Vater, Dieter Rudolf, La Mesa.
Villarreal, Ricardo, Fallbrook.
Wafer, David Earl, Richmond.
Walker, Gary Layne, Cudahy.
Walker, William John, Riverside.
Walton, Craig Leslie, San Jose.
Warren, Donald Albert, San Diego.
Washburn, Robert Glen, California City.
Waugh, Randall Michael, Paramount.
Weed, Donald Edmond, Port Hueneme.
Weidemier, Peter Joseph, Alameda.
Wentzell, Jeffrey Raymond, San Francisco.
West, Russell Udell, Orange.
Westberry, Vincent Douglas, Los Angeles.
Weymouth, Theodore Gay, Torrance.
Whittier, Mark Crosby, Whittier.
Williams, Charles Robert, Oakland.
Williams, Frederick H., Jr., Sutter Creek.
Williams, James Alec, Bishop.
Williams, Larry Ellis, San Jose.
Williams, Michael Walter, Artesia.
Williamson, Donald Ray, San Jose.
Wilson, David Lewis, Hornbrook.
Wilson, Royce Harold, Jr., Montague.
Wolfe, Joseph Kent, Los Angeles.
Worley, Kenneth Lee, Modesto.
Wright, Charles Fred, Vallejo.
Wright, Edward Taylor, Los Angeles.
Wright, Henry Arthur, Oakland.
Wright, James William II, San Diego.
Wright, Robert Edward, Sacramento.
Wyatt, John Wesley, Jr., East Palo Alto.
Yamanaka, Roger Kimo, Costa Mesa.
Yohn, William Leon, Fresno.
Young, Lewis John, La Puente.
Zimmerman, David Paul, Pasadena.
Zucroff, Steven Dale, Panorama City.
Zuniga, Charles Edward, Los Angeles.

Navy

Barrett, Michael Barry, Los Angeles.
Benson, Lee David, San Mateo.
Borders, John William, Jr., Saugas.
Brunton, Stephen Cornell, Ukiah.
Calzia, Frank Vincent, El Segundo.
Cardinale, James Anthony, Danville.
Carli, David Arthur, Vallejo.
Carter, Jackie Charles, San Jose.
Chester, Dennis Edward, Fair Oaks.
Clasen, Michael Roy, Napa.
Dawson, Frank Arthur, Fairfield.
Dunning, Timothy Charles, Santa Ana.
Ford, Patrick Osborne, San Francisco.
Haskins, Michael Wayne, Ventura.
Hayden, Glenn Miller, Long Beach.
Hodel, Mark Edward, Lodi.
Homuth, Richard Wendal, Spring Valley.
Hooper, Barry Wayne, Redondo Beach.
Howard, James Bryon, Bakersfield.
Hyland, John Peter, Santa Barbara.
Karger, Barry Edwin, Prather.
Kasch, Frederick Morrison, San Diego.
Kravitz, James Stephen, Riverside.
Lerch, Earl Roger, San Francisco.
Lewis, James C. Ralph, San Diego.
Long, Leonard, Tulare.
Lopez, Jose Angel, Jr., Sanger.
Macagba, Edilberto Cula, Albany.
Madrid, Michael Phillip, Stockton.
McGlochlin, David Earl, Carmel Valley.
Mercer, William Ivan, Los Angeles.
Meredith, Gary Lee, Fremont.
Moriarity, Patrick Dale, Napa.
Myrick, George Franklin, Los Angeles.
Parkinson, Gary Convers, Turlock.
Pettit, Craig Steven, Martinez.
Pritchett, Gregory Gene, Walnut.
Rambur, Michael James, Chula Vista.
Retzloff, James Robert, Jr., Redding.
Royall, Leslie William, III, Roseville.
Schlote, Louis Chris, Fort Bragg.
Scott, Dayne York, Hawthorne.
Siow, Gale Robert, Huntington Park.
Smith, Vernon Parr, Los Angeles.
Staten, Robert Joseph, Ontario.
Volz, Stephen Thomas, Lakewood.
Wagner, Robert Kay, Barstow.
Wentz, Mitchell Allen, Lompoc.
White, Charles Mott, Sr., Lathrop.
Zillgitt, Donald Henry, Inglewood.

Army

Addison, Harvey Charles, Ojai.
Alveraz, Cyril Anthony, El Sobrante.
Armstrong, Kenneth Daniel, Santa Cruz.
Austin, Larry D., San Bernardino.
Bafile, John Anthony, Sepulveda.
Bamford, Thomas Campbell, Fullerton.
Baron, Douglas Ken, Campbell.
Baza, Joseph Cruz, Sunnyvale.
Beamon, Thomas Keith, South Gate.
Bingman, Ronald Howard, Albany.
Briggs, Larry Ishmuel, Los Angeles.
Brogoitti, Bruce Clayton, Pasadena.
Caiquep, Jose, San Francisco.
Canright, Steven Craig, Castro Valley.
Carlock, John Ronald, Los Angeles.
Carpenter, Scott Marshall, Littlerock.
Chap de Laine, Arnold A., Jr., Arroyo Grande.
Clark, Michael Burriss, Lancaster.
Coalson, Stephen Edward, Santa Monica.
Cooper, Roy Eldon, El Monte.
Craig, Gary Raymond, Los Angeles.
Cunningham, Norman Northro, Van Nuys.
D Emanuele, Robert Paul, Sunland.
Davis, Thomas Joel, Placerville.
Devore, Kenneth Roy, Fullerton.
Doolittle, Ronald Louis, Santa Rosa.
Duncan, Timothy Joseph, Pasadena.
Dunkin, James Edgar, Jr., Coachella.
Eckl, Thomas Anthony, Pomona.
Edwards, Bobby Brance, Torrance.
Engle, Darrell Leroy, Lawndale.
Escageda, Jesus, Los Angeles.
Favata, Sam Joseph, Pico Rivera.
Fenn, Melvin B., Compton.
Ferguson, Michauel Don, Riverside.
Folmar, Mason Ophelia, Wilmington.
Franckowiak, Joseph Ralph, Huntington Park.
Franco, Francisco, Orosi.
Garrett, Lawrence Casey, Colton.
Gifford, Howard M., Ferndale.
Gines, Manuel Louis, Sacramento.
Gonzales, Jim Roy, Lompoc.
Granelle, Amedee George, Jr., Montclair.
Grant, William Richard, Huntington Beach.
Griego, Clarence, Barstow.
Gruber, Frederick Louis, Sierra Madre.
Guthrie, Steven Allen, Rialto.
Guymon, Alan Russell, Lomita.
Harms, Gary La Monte, Inglewood.
Hartman, William Taylor, El Cajon.
Hattori Masaki, Stockton.
Holt James Charles, Hawthorne.
Ingram, Robert Howard, Chula Vista.
James, Ronald Eugene, El Cerrito.
Jett, Jimmie Joe, Los Angeles.
Jones, Earl Timothy, Los Angeles.
Kaneski, Robert Adam, Chino.
Keiper, George Frederick, Burbank.
Kendall, James D., National City.
King, James Allen, Palmdale.
Knott, Dennis Lee, Long Beach.
Knutson, James Keith, Martinez.
Law, Jerald Lee, Pittsburg.
Leal, Chrisfino Dennis, San Diego.
Lee, Loren Victor, Vallejo.
Lemus, Charles Ruiz, Barstow.
Lo Forti, Paul Rosario, Palo Alto.
Luke, Arnold Wayne, Los Angeles.
Magee, John Earl, Los Angeles.
Mahoney, Alfred Richard, Jr., Pasadena.
Maruck, Michael Patrick, Union City.
Matson, Gary Lee, Alameda.
Matteson, Lynn Michael, Hawthorne.
Mazon, Theodore, Jr., Sacramento.
McCurtain, Charles Ray, Jr., Brentwood.
McGlothin, Raymond Dennis, Lomita.
McKiernan, Timothy James, Norco.
McPhail, Franklin Lloyd, Los Angeles.
Melvin, Michael Wayne, Ventura.
Meyer, Gary Antone, Diamond Springs.
Miller, Kent Froemming, Corte Madera.
Muntion, Arturo Daniel, Stockton.
Moore, Derryl Lee, Los Angeles.
Morley, Jeffrey Paul, Manhattan Beach.
Morris, Donald Warren, Taft.
Mosby, Statue, Jr., Los Angeles.
Nardelli, Robert Joseph, Redondo Beach.
Nious, Elvain Ennis, San Francisco.
Obert, Richard Robert, Modesto.
Osburn, Fred Harrison, Jr., San Diego.
Ozbun, James D., Fairfield.
Parker, Jimmie Edward, Fremont.
Perez, Peter, Mendota.
Powell, Edwin, Gilbert, Jr., Los Angeles.
Pugh, Richard Carl, Sherman Oaks.
Rainbolt, James Edward, San Diego.
Ridenhour, Darwin Bruce, Riverside.
Riggs, Willard Wayne, Pittsburg.
Roddam, Rodney Allen, Anaheim.
Rogers, Ronald Lee, Los Gatos.
Schroeder, Jerry Dean, Santa Rosa.
Seidel, Walter James, Merced.
Shaffer, Jonathan Peter, San Mateo.
Shaughnessy, James J., Jr., Sacramento.
Sloan, Douglas Dean, San Andreas.
Smith, Mark Edward, Lake View Terrace.
Smith, Robert Eugene, Jr., Newark.
Smoot, Robert Gene, Sacramento.
Soward, Douglas, Hayward.
Suydam, John Howard, III, Merced.
Swabby, Brent Leslie, El Monte.
Sylvestre, Armand Alvin, San Jose.
Terry, Marvin Hall, Pomona.
Tomlinson, David Cullen, Garden Grove.
Tomlinson, Robert Dale, San Leandro.
Tubre, Stephen Renier, North Highlands.
Vander, Dussen George, Artesia.
Weaver, Timothy Patrick, Montclair.
Wedman, Kenneth Albert, Newark.
Wells, Frank, Jr., San Francisco.
Werner, Norbert Otto, Cypress.
West, James Oscar, Berkeley.
Whaley, James Goodwin, Sacramento.
Whipkey, Richard Allen, Long Beach.
Whitaker, Jere Lee, Chula Vista.
White, William Henry, Coalinga.
Wilkes, Robert Lee, Corona.
Wright, Thomas Clay, Torrance.
Zirfas, Ewald, Los Angeles.

Air Force

Czarnecki, Steven Charles, Los Angeles.
Heckler, Fredrick Merriman, North Hollywood.
Leadbetter, Roger Gordon, Visalia.
Liebernecht, Von Miles, Burbank.
Luce, Paul Franklin, Oakland.
Miller, Robert Charles, Hayward.
Milligan, Randall Gale, Laton.
Reyes, Ruben Everardo, Los Angeles.
Richardson, Robert Brooks, Torrance.

Marine Corps

Clifton, Mancol Raymond, Santa Rosa.
Davis, Samuel Vernell, Los Angeles.
Diaz, Daniel, Long Beach.
Eckenrode, Marcus Richard, Mar Vista.
Ellis, George Walter, Hayward.
Evans, Donald Ray, Fremont.
Ewald, Robert Clarence, Bellflower.
Glancy, Lee O. Day III, San Diego.
Graham, Steven Louis, Long Beach.
Gransbury, Gerald Arlen, Los Angeles.
Holbrook, James Wendell, Paramount.
Howe, Larry Wayne, Fresno.
Lawson, Gary Don, Los Angeles.
Lindsay, Bruce Stuart, Lawndale.
Martin, John Charles, Merced.
McCord, David Michael, San Diego.
McGuire, Timothy Paul, Woodland Hills.
McKinney, Albert W., Jr., Imperial Beach.
McMillan, Bruce Francis, Walnut Creek.
McPhearson, James Carl, Long Beach.
Oneto, Harry Steven Jr., Sunnyvale.
Ott, Patrick Louis, Cupertino.
Payton, Venus DeWhit Jr., Oakland.
Perez, Joe Francisco Jr., Reedley.
Phillips, Thomas Miles, Healdsburg.
Pope, Serveston Devon, Modesto.
Quilalang, Anastacio Jr., Chula Vista.
Rumley, Richard Allen, Canoga Park.
Sanchez, Benny Kumiyama, Long Beach.
Schnack, Steven Spencer, San Bernardino.

Smith, Archie D., Richmond.
Stout, Terry Lee, Concord.
Strand, Philip Stanley Jr., Riverside.
Templeton, Raymond Woodrow, Dos Palos.
Todd, Robert James, Orange.
Treasure, Robert Joseph, Camarillo.
Uplinger, Barton John, Camarillo.

Navy

Battaglia, Christopher Pau, Burbank.
Bell, James Everrett, Watsonville.
Blakely, Martin George, San Francisco.
Chapa, Armando, Jr., San Jose.
Cherney, Peter Frederick, Whittier.
Cota, Ernest Kend, San Diego.
Fisher, Robert Gene, La Puente.
Heep, William Arthur, San Pedro.
Jackson, Donney Lyrce, Los Angeles.
Kollmann, Glenn Edward, Daly City.
Krissman, Rudy Paul, Santa Clara.
Pritchard, William John, Lancaster.
Ramsden, Gerald Lee, Fresno.
Reedy, William Henry, Jr., Merced.
Sander, James Kieth, Carlsbad.
Shockley, Ronald David, Porterville.
Smith, Richard John, Long Beach.

JULY 1, 1969–JULY 31, 1969

Army

Bartholomew, Michael M., San Francisco.
Bertagna, Lawrence Joseph, Round Mountain.
Beverford, Timothy Wayne, Los Angeles.
Bliner, John Edward, Santa Clara.
Bruner, Mark Leroy, Rio Dell.
Buckles, Richard Lee, Pacific Grove.
Carter, Leslie Dean, Jr., Campbell.
Casey, Daniel Gene, Concord.
Chiacchio, Joseph S., Jr., Glendale.
Cisneros, Jose B., Baldwin Park.
De Marcus, Jerry Dennis, San Diego.
Delgado, Jose Alejandro, Los Angeles.
Discoll, John Raymond, III, San Mateo.
Enriquez, Lucas R., Milpitas.
Pladger, Ralph Samuel, Garden Grove.
Floyd, Garland Dale, El Sobrante.
Gardiner, Robert Paul, Anaheim.
Gomolicke, Leonard Michael, Cupertino.
Greville, Leonard George, Crescent City.
Grove Cordell, Compton.
Harrell, Stephen Carl, Sunland.
Herbst, Thomas William, Northridge.
Holeman, Ronald Steven, Santa Monica.
Hubbard, Alfred Willie, Florence.
Huebner, Herman Henry, Reedley.
Huerta, Tommy, Los Angeles.
Krom, Michael Lee, Twain.
Larson, Richard Kemp, Santa Ana.
Maier, David Roy, Long Beach
Matthews, Bernard Julian, North Hollywood.
McNelly, William Robert, Ft. Mason.
Mitchell, Michael Thomas, Pittsburg.
Motley, Larry Keith, French Camp.
Newman, Dennis Earl, Monrovia.
Nunnally, Timothy Craig, Pico Rivera.
O'Keefe, Robert William, Davis.
Olmos, Alfonso, Pico Rivera.
Pearlstein, Jerrold S., Los Angeles.
Proctor, William C., Jr., Burbank.
Reed, Gary Walton, Eureka.
Reyes, Henry R., Porterville.
Rizzo, Robert Charles, Santa Clara.
Rodriguez, Joe Ignacio, San Jose.
Rogers, Michael Frederick, San Bernardino.
Ruebel, Joseph Peter, Los Angeles.
Sato Takeshi, Port Hueneme.
Smith, Jackie Lee, Barstow.
Sotelo, Luis Alonzo, Tulare.
Terrazas, Juan Luis, Los Angeles.
Torres, Raymond, La Mesa.
Tryon, Lee, Jr., San Diego.
Weekley, Clifford Wayne, Bellflower.

Air Force.

Flinn, John Leroy, San Diego.
Sizemore, James Elmo, San Diego.

Marine Corps

Anderson, William Olin, Pacoima.
Dowdell, Stephen, Alhambra.
Garcia, Arnold Falcon, Moorpark.
Hamilton, Glenn Anthony, Los Angeles.

Martinez, Ernie Robles, Fremont.
Meeks, Charles Henry, Jr., Los Angeles.
Pearson, John Howard, San Mateo.
Rocha, Feliciano, Los Angeles.
Sandoval, Alan Paul, Lomita.
Sparks, Henry Eugene, Los Angeles.
Storm, Ralph Dorman, Union City.
Whiting, Malcolm D., III, Granada Hills.
Wright, Silas Clifton, Eureka.

Navy

Easton, Robert Glenn, Granada Hills.

Army

Engel, Gregory Charles, Van Nuys.
Grinnell, George A[illegible]n, San Pablo.
Henderson, Kayle Dean, Vista.
Holliday, Clyde Lee, Anaheim.
McCann, Michael Ross, Hermosa Beach.
McManus, Mark Lawrence, Los Angeles.
Morris, Kelly Stuart, Arcata.

Air Force

Orsua, Charles David, Sunnyvale.

Marine Corps

Basile, Patrick Lynn, Fontana.
Callaghan, Thomas Leonard, Atherton.
Hamilton, Roland Charles, Anaheim.
McGuire, Richard Harold, San Jose.
Wright, David Daniel, Ventura.

Navy

Burgess, Robert Howard, Walnut Creek.
Garza, Richard, Jr., San Jose.
Matthews, Floyd Joseph, Los Angeles.
Pearson, Gregory John, Encino.

JANUARY 1, 1969–JUNE 30, 1969

Army

Adams, Leon Henry, El Monte.
Adcok, Richard Lynn, Hinkley.
Aguirre, Joseph Anthony, Orange.
Alagna, Peter Leonard, Santa Ana.
Alaniz, Frederico, Jr., Watsonville.
Alderson, Benjamin Robert, Redding.
Allred, Rex Charles, Ventura.
Almeida, Joe, Jr., Los Angeles.
Alvarez, Alex Jim, Compton.
Arvizu, Xavier Amado, Monterey Park.
Atuatasi, Sa, Jr., Wilmington.
Axton, Edwin Everette, Santa Cruz.
Baca, Richard David, Ventura.
Baker, Ronald Ray, Concord.
Bangs, Christopher Delbert, Carmichael.
Banks, Robert Alan, Shafter.
Barker, Dana Randolph, San Diego.
Barnes, Marvin Donald, Alturas.
Barnes, Richard Leigh, Bellflower.
Barnett, Steven Paul, Burbank.
Barnholdt, Terry Joe, Garden Grove.
Barrett, Robert Lee, Jr., Los Angeles.
Barrios, James Patrick, Lemoore.
Barth, Thomas Frederick, Lakewood.
Bartlett, John Rex, Vallejo.
Bartman, Steven Douglas, San Diego.
Baumgardner, Duane Roy, Cloverdale.
Baxter, Jerry, Susanville.
Beall, Tyson Vance, Napa.
Beaman, Ronald Ralph, Oildale.
Beaumont, Robert Eugene, San Jose.
Bellamy, John Michael, Van Nuys.
Bennett, Robert Lloyd, Salinas.
Berry, James Edward, San Fernando.
Bird, Kenneth Robert, Monrovia.
Blakey, Michael Archie, North Highlands.
Bock, Jimmie Van, Vacaville.
Boles, Joey Lee, Wasco.
Bowden, Byron Bill, Arcata.
Bowen, Duane Curtis, Ramona.
Bowen, John Lewis, Monterey.
Bowles, Theophilus, San Francisco.
Boydston, Oscar Dan, San Francisco.
Bozeman, Perry Leonard, Lomita.
Bradford, Sherman Duane, Arleta.
Brown, Gale Lee, Lakewood.
Brown, Richard Allen, Lakewood.
Brown, Roger Louis, Costa Mesa.
Brown, Ronald A., Huntington Park.
Bruce, William Jack, Pomona.
Bugarin, Benjamin, Sepulveda.
Bumgarner, Thomas Edward, West Sacramento.
Bundy, Lincoln E., Redding.
Burfoot, Phillip Duane, Barstow.
Burke, William James, Jr., Menlo Park.
Burleson, Clarence Paul, Fairfield.
Burnett, David Leigh, Lone Pine.
Burns, James David, Oakland.
Burns, Richard Allen, Fontana.
Byrd, James Carmen, Norwalk.
Calderon, Felix Antonio, Burbank.
Campbell, Jack Donald, San Pablo.
Campbell, Robert John, Burbank.
Canavan, Martin Joseph, Jr., Barstow.
Caputo, Michael John, Alhambra.
Caraway, Johnnie J., Los Angeles.
Carrasco, Arthuro, Santa Maria.
Carrasco, Daniel, Cucamonga.
Carroll, Timothy Michael, San Jose.
Case, Robert Don, Weaverville.
Casias, Christopher, Woodland.
Castro, Louis, Union.
Catelli, Charles John, Santa Rosa.
Chacon, Robert Reinhard, San Bernardino.
Christensen, Harold Roy, West Covina.
Christianson, David B., Oroville.
Clark, Ernest Lee, San Marcos.
Clirehugh, Robert W., Jr., San Francisco.
Clutter, Carl Norman, Wilmington.
Cole, Robert Owen, Sacramento.
Collins, Jonathan, III, Los Angeles.
Colomber, James Stephen, McCloud.
Compton, Robert William, Pacifica.
Cooke, Larry Houston, Castro Valley.
Cooper, Donald Ray, Carmichael.
Corbin, Ronald James, Long Bach.
Corr, Paul, Jr., Anaheim.
Corri, Gary Allen, Oakland.
Crambelt, Howard Earl, Santa Clara.
Creal, Carl Martin, Palos Verdes Estate.
Creason, W. K. Utah, Quincy.
Cruise, Kenneth T., Jr., San Francisco.
Crump, Erskine Logan, Berkeley.
Cruz, Johnny Manuel, Sacramento.
Cummings, David Guy, Crescent City.
Cummins, Thomas Wayne, Marysville.
Currence, William Allen, Santa Clara.
Curtis, Roger Dale, Winters.
Curtright, Larry Brent, San Bernardino.
Daniels, Bruce William, Fresno.
Daniels, William Jr., Calexico.
Darden, Otis James, Berkeley.
Davenport, Robert Malcum, Manteca.
Davis, Larry Kent, Redding.
Davis, Robert Scott, Gardena.
De Aro, Stephen Wayne, Los Angeles.
De La Paz, Abel Joseph, Pleasanton.
De La Torre, Jose Manuel, Fullerton.
Dedman, Julian Dean, Norwalk.
Deitrick, George Douglas, Antioch.
Devore, Kenneth Roy, Fullerton.
Diehl, Harry G., Oceanside.
Dixon, Michael Kenneth L., Torrance.
Doran, Sean Timothy, Lennox.
Dotson, Eugene Lewis, Stockton.
Dulley, Kenneth Lawrence, Brea.
Duperry, Peter Alfred, Whittier.
Dwyer, Patrick William, Hollywood.
Eade, Raymond Frederick, King City.
Edwards, Bobby Brance, Torrance.
Edwards, Johnny Lawrence, Downey.
Eisman, James Frederick, Whittier.
Erickson, Philip Charles, Garden Grove.
Escamilla, Joseph, San Jose.
Estes, Brian Robert, Whittier.
Evans, Michael John, Maywood.
Ewing, Jerry Lew, Madera.
Fanfa, Anthony John, Oakland.
Ferouge, Ronald Walter, San Leandro.
Flores, Edwardo, San Jose.
Ford, Richard Wayne, Modesto.
Fox, James Carl, Arcadia.
Francis, James Patrick, Napa.
Freitas, Robert Edwin, Merced.
Frost, Herbert Cornelius, Alhambra.
Fullerton, James Price, Pasadena.
Garcia, Andrew Perez, Castroville.
Garcia, Antonio Mendez, Needles.
Garcia, Nickolas Gastelum, Five Points.
Garcia, Richard Calude, Morgan Hill.
Gardner, Gordon Dwight, Sunnyvale.
Gastelum, Eugene, San Diego.
Gates, Alfred Alan, Sunnyvale.
Gavia, Joseph Jess, Oxnard.
Gilles, Alan Clark, Pacoima.

Girard, Charles Pierre, Pasadena.
Godoy, Peter, Jr., Los Angeles.
Goeller, Michael Dennis, Nevada City.
Gonzales, Carlos M., El Monte.
Gordon, John Heber, Bakersfield.
Gorvad, Peter Lawrence, Oakland.
Graff, Allen Michael, Manhattan Beach.
Graham, Roy Wayne, Sacramento.
Grant, Herbert Raymond, San Rafael.
Greenlaw, Alan Heald, Redding.
Greer, Dennis Dale, Los Gatos.
Griswold, Scott Craig, San Jose.
Grubbs, Garey Lee, Torrance.
Guenther, John Carl, Jr., Fair Oaks.
Hahn, Harlan Leslie, Livermore.
Hall, Leonard John, Menlo Park.
Hanbury, David Delaney, Whittier.
Hansen, Mark John, Reseda.
Harrington, Timothy Michael, Sepulveda.
Harvey, Jeffrey Arnold, Burlingame.
Hatley, Eddie Lee, Stockton.
Hatzell, Michael Maxwell, San Jose.
Haug, Fred Gunder, Merced.
Heath, Isaac Edward, Torrance.
Heinmiller, Robert Lynn, Fresno.
Helgeson, Dale George, Lawndale.
Henry, Frederick John, Van Nuys.
Hensley, John, North Fork.
Hernandez, Phillip, Guadalupe.
Herring, Steven Wayne, Freedom.
Hicks, Frank Edward, Pomona.
Higginbotham, Larry Gene, Porterville.
Hight, Charles Benny, Visalia.
Hill, Allan Bruce, Torrance.
Horal, Thomas Glen, Sunnyvale.
Horn, Alan Murray, Lakewood.
Howard, David Terrell, La Habra.
Huckaba, Thomas James, Sacramento.
Huffman, David Jay, Ontario.
Humphries, Gary Dean, San Pablo.
Hunt, Calvin Gene, Bakersfield.
Huntley, Michael Alan, San Diego.
Hwang, Gerald Richard, Palo Alto.
Inguillo, John Deogracias, Watsonville.
Israel, Ralph Waldo, Jr., Chula Vista.
Jacques, Felix, Fresno.
Jacques, Kennedy, Anaheim.
Jenkins, Steven Lee, Santa Ana.
Jensen, Kenneth Vern, Sacramento.
Jerse, William Edward, El Cajon.
Johnson, Charles Aaron, Compton.
Johnson, Franklin A., El Cajon.
Johnson, Harold Benjamin, Oakland.
Johnson, Kenneth Paul, Bakersfield.
Johnson, Stephen Howard, Trona.
Jones, Charles Alexander, Tulare.
Jones Terry Edward, Whittier.
Jordan, Paul Robert, Sacramento.
Keister, Lawrence Lee, Sacramento.
Keith, Dennis Meves, Santa Paula.
Kellison, David Glenn, Cucamonga.
Kennedy, Edward Henry, Oceanside.
King, David Glenn, Tahoe.
King, Donald Gene, Lakewood.
Kinnard, James Edward, Vista.
Kipp, Donald Lee, Montclair.
Kubler, Garry Lee, Lodi.
Kunkel, Alfred Henry, Jr., Lakewood.
Laguna, Mario Montes, Marysville.
Larimer, Keith Wayne, Tulare.
Lawrence, Bobby Gene, Sacramento.
Lawson, Daniel W., North Highlands.
Layton, Ronald Dean, Sacramento.
Leake, Ronald James, Jr., Glendora.
Leinen, Gregory Michael, Long Beach.
Lema, Anthony Leroy, Hughson.
Leonard, James Michael, Edmond.
Levett, William James, Pasadena.
Levin, Robert Phillip, Palm Springs.
Lew, Vincent Gene, Sacramento.
Lewis, Calvin, Fontana.
Lewis, John Stephen, California Hot Springs.
Lewis, Joseph Anthony, Manteca.
Lewis, Stephen Mix, Torrance.
Lizarraga, Michael Wayne, Richmond.
Lohmeyer, Douglas Edward, Sacramento.
Lopez, John, Compton.
Lopez, Victor, Solana Beach.
Lortz, John Edward, III, Los Angeles.
Love, John, Jr., Hollywood.
Lozano, Fernando Leonard, Los Angeles.
Lucas, Clyde Austin, Mendocino.
Lucia, Stephen Wayne, Newport Beach.
Lukins, Paul Roger, Riverside.
Mac Leod, Phillip Lesley, Glendale.
Madden, David Allen, Arbuckle.
Madrid, Adano Hernendez, Los Angeles.
Mansergh, William A., Jr., San Jose.
Mardis, James Arnold, Jr., Vandenberg AFB.
Martin, John Anthony, III, Los Angeles.
Martin, Larry Allen, Bellflower.
Martinez, Chris Ronald, Alameda.
Martinez, Paul Dinnes, Jr., San Francisco.
Mattera, Frank John Joe, Los Angeles.
McAdoo, Glenn Paul, Bell.
McAtee, Don Jay, Castro Valley.
McCarthy, Joseph F., Jr., Los Angeles.
McCarthy, Terry Alan, San Diego.
McCorkle, Leslie Leroy, Yuba City.
McElroy, Dennis Arthur, Modesto.
McLellan, Jimmy Lee, Huntington Beach.
Mearns, Glenn Rodney, Hacienda Heights.
Miller, Marvin Ray, Riverside.
Miller, Paul Wayne, San Diego.
Mischeaux, Rene Clarence, San Francisco.
Mitchell, Mark David, La Puente.
Mohnike, Phillip Sherman, Visalia.
Montanez, Paris William, Fontana.
Montapert, Ronald M., Los Angeles.
Morgan, David Robert, Altadena.
Morgan, John Louis, Jr., Pacoima.
Morgan, Ronald Edward, San Diego.
Morrell, William Alexander, Hayward.
Morris, John Frederick, Sacramento.
Mortensen, Allan David, El Cajon.
Moschetti, Bill Arthur, Oakland.
Moss, Charles Lee, Jr., San Diego.
Muller, Allen Donald, Ventura.
Murphy, Billy Dan, Santa Clara.
Narcisse, Alvin Ray, San Francisco.
Negrini, William Lodi, West Covina.
Nicholson, James Alexander, Highland.
Niederhause, Stephen Scott, Reseda.
Nix, Warren Paul, Los Angeles.
Nordell, John Edward, Jr., Lodi.
Oens, La Vern Oren, Placerville.
Offerdahl, William Bruce, Hawaiian Gardens.
Oleta, Jesus C., Jr., Norwalk.
Oliver, Rick Alton, Chula Vista.
Ortegon, Richard Joseph, Fremont.
Owen, Steven Craig, Long Beach.
Ozbun, James D., Fairfield.
Paco, Richard Manuel, Pacoima.
Paddock, Michael L., Ventura.
Paepke, Duane Carl, Jr., Galt.
Palacios, Tony, Moorpark.
Parker, Ronnie Earl, Fullerton.
Parker, Roy Eugene, Shell Beach.
Pearson, Van Harvey, Newark.
Pedersen, Kenneth Ralph, Brentwood.
Peebler, Christy Albert, Tustin.
Pequeno, Juan Rodriguez, Gilroy.
Peters, Lauvi Paul Philip, Garden Grove.
Peterson, David Bruce, Bellflower.
Pettigrew, Kenneth Dale, Redding.
Pinney, John Scott, China Lake.
Porte, Robert Andrew, Reedley.
Porter, Michael Grant, Anaheim.
Posten, Gerald Wayne, Placerville.
Powell, Leslie Allen, Norwalk.
Proctor, Rickey Allen, Redding.
Protto, Robert B., Jr., Sunnyvale.
Proudfoot, Timothy Cole, San Jose.
Puentes, Miguel Angel, San Jose.
Queener, Ulysses Grant, Jr., Los Angeles.
Quintana, Juan Carlos, Daly City.
Radtke, Carl Leonard, Newhall.
Rains, Clyde Edward, Covelo.
Ramirez, Hildefonso M., Watsonville.
Ramirez, John Arthur, San Jose.
Ramirez, Ralph Albert, Jr., San Pablo.
Randall, Lynn Murray, San Jose.
Reed, Melvin L., Jr., Los Angeles.
Ricardo, Salvador Ortencio, San Francisco.
Rice, Gregory Lloyd, Granada Hills.
Richardson, Donald Harold, Redwood City.
Rideout, David James, San Bernardino.
Riley, Ronald Howard, Sanger.
Robbins, Jay Lee, Jr., Stockton.
Robbins, Jerry Clayton, Martinez.
Roberts, Stephen Lord, Redlands.
Robinson, Kenneth James, Fontana.
Roe, Linus Robert, Dos Palos.
Ross, Douglas Alan, Temple City.
Ross, Larry Thomas, Arcata.
Ross, Paul R., Huntington Beach.
Ross, Roger Dale, Hayward.
Rowe, William Edwin, Costa Mesa.
Rowles, Steven Robert, Glendora.
Rubio, Peter Paul, La Puente.
Ruggeri, Antonio, Ontario.
Ruiz Salvadore Iniguez, Sacramento.
Rush, David Clyde, Los Angeles.
Russell, Ronald Patrick, El Cajon.
Russell, Wayne, Los Angeles.
Sadler, Thomas Wayne, Oakland.
Sand, Ralph Thomas, La Habra.
Santos, Layne Michael, Los Angeles.
Savage, Douglas Paul, Covina.
Scurr, Kenneth Wesley, Grass Valley.
See, Richard Charles, Sunnyvale.
Segura, Steven Rey, San Francisco.
Sekva, Robert Glenn, Hayward.
Sellers, Richard Taylor, Jr., Palos Verdes Estates.
Shaughnessy, Edward Jerome, Hawthorne.
Shepard, Lawrence Robert, Napa.
Sheridan, Robert Edward, Placentia.
Short, Charles Dudley, Ontario.
Shugart, Lynn Doyle, Banning.
Shuster, Darryl Wayne, Hayward.
Simpson, Larry Douglas, Sloat.
Sloan, Robert Leland, North Hollywood.
Sloppye, Robert Royce, Sacramento.
Smith, Charles Clarence, Jr., Saugus.
Smith, Christopher Scott, Torrance.
Smith, Dennis Allen, Gridley.
Smith, Donald Ray, Placerville.
Smith, John Calvin, San Jose.
Smith, Larry Wayne, Bakersfield.
Sours, Bruce Michael, Concord.
Souza, Chris Anthony, Lakewood.
Souza, Francis Louis, Orange.
Sparks, Glenn Louis, Buena Park.
Spear, John Randall, Anaheim.
Stephens, Hays Charles, Los Angeles.
Stephens, Larry Allan, Travis AFB.
Stork, Robert John, Jr., Oakland.
Street, Tobby Windfield, Riauto.
Strickland, Douglas Lee, Port Chicago.
Stuessel, James David, La Puente.
Suarez, Encarnacion Alegre, Escondido.
Sullivan, Raymond Walter, San Francisco.
Tapia, Moises, Los Angeles.
Taylor, John Raymond, Taft.
Taylor, Rudy Ronnie, Hacienda Heights.
Taylor, Wayne Oliver, Anaheim.
Teal, Fred Thomas, Cucamonga.
Tenorio, Rafael Gabriel, Santa Rosa.
Thielen, John Roger, El Monte.
Thiery, John, Fairfield.
Thompson, Bruce Wayne, Glendale.
Thompson, Richard Vickers, Auburn.
Thompson, Robert Eugene, Fullerton.
Thompson, Thomas Donald, Jr., Los Angeles.
Tiderencel, John Werner, Broderick.
Tiffany, David L., Riverside.
Tipton, Timothy Taylor, Dixon.
Titmas, James, III, Panorama City.
Toth, Bertalan James, San Francisco.
Trejo, John Michael, Pomona.
Tritsch, Philip Alon, Nevada City.
Tucker, Gregory Charles, Santa Clara.
Ulida, Manuel Gurrola, East Los Angeles.
Valadez, Richard Paul, Los Angeles.
Valencia, Clement, Jr., Los Angeles.
Valero, John Juan, San Francisco.
Valdv, James Damion, Downey.
Vande-Vegte, Douglas Lee, Lakewood.
Vendelin, Thomas Leslie, San Mateo.
Verdugo, Adalberto R. E., Los Angeles.
Villalobos, Ignacio L., Pico Rivera.
Villanueva, Francisco, Jr., McFarland.
Volheim, Michael Cory, Hayward.
Walker, James Daniel, Santa Maria.
Waller, John Bussey, Berkeley.
Warington, Charles W., Jr., Woodland Hills.
Weber, Paul Frederick, Lemon Grove.
Webster, Howard Gregory, Riverside.
Weigt, Stephen Lenn, Cloverdale.
Weir, John Randolph, Norwalk.
West, James Clifford, Jr., North Hollywood.

White, Marvin Charles, Ramona.
White, Richard Allen, Monterey.
Whynaught, Jeffrey Lyle, San Clemente.
Wikle, Ricky Lynn, Concord.
Williams, Craig Emery, Lakewood.
Williams, Jack Elwin, Eureka.
Williams, Robert Alwyn, Napa.
Wilson, Ronald Kelley, Mountain View.
Wimer, Robert Arnold, Eureka.
Wood, Todd Louis, Chico.
Woodside, Michael Lee, Long Beach.
Word, William Keneith, Sunnyvale.
Worl, Leslie Wayne, Long Beach.
Worthington, Laurence D., Fullerton.
Yabiku, Takeshi, Los Angeles.
Yanez, Victor Manuel, San Francisco.
Young, Samuel Lee, Los Angeles.
Ziegler, Stanley Bruce, Cedarpines Park.
Zufelt, Roy Glenn, Palmdale.

Air Force

Asada, Ronald Kazuo, Mountain View.
Cordero, William Edward, Santa Barbara.
Davis, Albert Jackson, Fallbrock.
Di Figlia, Frank Anthony, Burbank.
Fink, Robert Alton, San Diego.
Hayden, Neil William, Redding.

Marine Corps

Abeyta, Ernest, Los Angeles.
Allman, Jonathan Wayne, La Habra.
Angel, Michael Eugene, Hayward.
Atkins, Doyle, Modesto.
Barron, Jeffrey Michael, La Puente.
Bastyr, Douglas Bruce, Chatsworth.
Bell, Samuel Wayne, San Francisco.
Blosky, Gene Orville, Los Angeles.
Borquez, Lawrence Gabe, Los Angeles.
Bosbery, Donald Charles, Daly City.
Britton, Murry Lawrence, San Francisco.
Brown, Randolph, Jr., North Highlands.
Bullard, Victor Walker, Jr., Northridge.
Burick, John Anthony, Jr., San Pedro.
Burke, William Davidson, Jr., Oxnard.
Burris, Victor Antonieo, Los Angeles.
Calhoun, Robert Darrell, Lemon Grove.
Carroll, Peter Richard, Winters.
Christianson, Ronald F., Redding.
Cincotta, Thomas Antone, San Rafael.
Conner, Melvin Hubbard, Jr., Riverside.
Cook, John Philip, Cypress.
Costa, William Carl, Los Molinos.
Councill, Arthur Coby, III, Hawthorne.
Cowan, Paul Allen, Arleta.
Cox, Gary Allen, Selma.
Crites, Robert Lincoln, Jr., Colton.
Culverhouse, Leon Thomas, Torrance.
Curci, Anthony Boy, Riverside.
Davis, Duane Ross, Fortuna.
Day, Kevin Lloyd, San Diego.
Deleidi, Richard Agustine, El Cajon.
Delgado, Raymond Rodriguez, Watsonville.
Denlinger, David Wood, San Diego.
Dolan, David Patrick, San Pedro.
Duggan, Thomas Patrick, Berkeley.
Dycus, Rickey Dale, Long Beach.
Earley, John Richard, Eureka.
Edwards, Donald Mac, Norwalk.
Elliott, David Ray, Orinda.
Ellis, Dennis Floyd, Porterville.
Facchini, Stephen Dale, Riverside.
Foster, John Michael, Garden Grove.
Foulke, Jeffrey Howard, Woodland Hills.
Friel, Bruce Gary, San Jose.
Fry, Stephen Michael, Citrus Heights.
Gallion, Gaylen Ray, Sylmar.
Gracia, Henry, Jr., National City.
Gardenhire, Jimmy Maryland, Garden Grove.
Gayer, Kenneth Eugene, Fresno.
Gendion, Robert Michael, Costa Mesa.
Glass, Donald Robert, Citrus Heights.
Goodlin, Jerry Lee, Le Puente.
Gould, William Andrew, Oxnard.
Graff, Paul Arnold, Sunnyvale.
Graham, David Bruce, Ventura.
Gramlick, Michael, Los Angeles.
Green, Michael Wayne, Hayward.
Griffin, Louis Fredrick, Oxnard.
Guevara, Irineo, Los Angeles.
Guillen, Davis Lawrence, Gardena.
Hall, James Kenneth, San Francisco.
Hall, James Oscar, Jr., Vista.
Hannibal, James Edward, Mountain View.
Haran, Rory Timothy T., Salinas.
Harmon, Norman Mark, Fullerton.
Harrison, James Richard, Reseda.
Heim, Richard Wayne, Covina.
Henderson, Arthur Franklyn, Los Angeles.
Henricks, Charles Drayton, Solana Beach.
Heredia, Miguel, Bakerfield.
Hicks, Michael Eugene, San Leandro.
Highfill, Robert Ray, Hacienda Heights.
Hill, John Robert, Altadena.
Horcajo, Robert Albert, Milpitas.
Howard, Sydney Claude, Lakewood.
Huff, Richard Elliot, Chester.
Hunnicutt, Jason David, Petaluma.
Hunt, Philip Michael, Chula Vista.
Icke, Ralph Edward, II, El Centro.
Jakobsen, Peter Laust, Northridge.
James, Charles Robert, Citrus Heights.
Jay, Robert Vern, Alturas.
Johnson, Charles Howard, Baldwin Park.
Jordan, Steve Eugene, Venice.
Juri, Elgin John, Menlo Park.
Keeling, Larry Dewayne, Pioneer Point.
Keen, Edwin Thomas, San Diego.
Koell, Dickie Dean, Jr., West Sacramento.
Kuebel, Andrew Michael, Glendora.
Kunkel, John Robert, Santa Clara.
Labowski, Leonard William, San Francisco.
Lestelle, John Andrew, II, Reseda.
Letson, Gary Wayne, San Francisco.
Lewis, Adron Lee, Hacienda Heights.
Lind, Morten Arvid, Jr., Placerville.
Liptak, Charles Lewis, Glendora.
Lira, Robert Chagoya, Indio.
Liss, Larry William, Oroville.
Marks, Phillip Haddon, Sherman Oaks.
Marshall, Michael Allen, Los Angeles.
Martin, Joseph Craig, La Mirada.
Massone, Michael Stacy, Stockton.
McDonald, Lewis Levi, Oakland.
McLean, Ronald Walsh, Beverly Hills.
McConnell, David Wayne, Hemet.
Meeks, Charles Henry, Jr., Los Angeles.
Metoyer, Michael Espy, Los Angeles.
Miller, Walter Ray, Jr., Garden Grove.
Misa, Tulele, Gardena.
Montgomery, Steven Hugh, Hayward.
Mooers, William Mathias, Los Angeles.
Mora, Gregorio Manuel, El Monte.
Morris, Harry Leo, Jr., Long Beach.
Mulholland, Robert Alton, Studio City.
Mullen, Larry Donald, Ojai.
Naylor, Lynn Pattinson, San Diego.
Nelson, Albert Oscar, Jr., Oceanside.
Nibbelink, Lea Everett, Los Alamitos.
Nicholas, Robert George, Orange Cove.
Nottingham, Richard Lance, La Puente.
Oliver, Erskine Jay, Sacramento.
Orr, Thomas Joseph, Garden Grove.
Paddock, Michael James, Atascadero.
Pagaling, Michael, Santa Maria.
Parisi, Guillermo, Los Angeles.
Parker, Kenneth, San Francisco.
Pastores, Gevin Pescozo, Oakland.
Pearcy, Robert Leslie, Big Bear Lake.
Peddy, Charles Lee, Fresno.
Perez, Jesus Albert, Los Angeles.
Peters, Edward Theodore, Jr., Castro Valley.
Phipps, Jimmy Wayne, Culver City.
Pinamonti, Ernest Anthony, Inglewood.
Pitts, Roy Edward, North Highlands.
Prater, Calvin Ray, Kerman.
Price, Thomas Gordan, Torrance.
Pringle, Emmett Terence, San Francisco.
Quinn, Anthony Louis, Gardena.
Ramirez, Joseph Ybarra, Jr., Huntington Park.
Raymond, Edward Robert, III, Riverside.
Reed, James Clayton, Los Angeles.
Regnolds, James Randolph, Los Altos.
Roddick, William Henry, Highland.
Rodriguez, Louis, Bakersfield.
Rodriguez, Reginald Joseph, Montebello.
Rose, Daniel Patrick, Los Angeles.
Rose, Leonard Dale, Herlong.
Russell, James Robert, Arcata
Saldana, Fernando Saenz, Los Angeles.
Sarakov, Harry Daniel, Chico.
Shields, Richard Dale, Bellflower.
Silva, George Lee, Nice.
Smith, Matthew Edward, San Jose.
Stitt, Richard Wesley, Paramount.
Storbo, Ronald Lawrence, San Rafael.
Swisher, Clifford Lee, Cypress.
Tarrance, William Blair, Torrance.
Taylor, Dennis Lee, San Lorenzo.
Taylor, Jerry Lewis, Norwalk.
Telles, Paul George, Newark.
Thornton, Alan Wayne, Lakewood.
Toreson, Robert Wayne, Sacramento.
Torres, Michael Angel, Gardena.
Trejo, Joseph, Jr., Corona.
Unfried, Barry Lon, Oroville.
Urnes James Lee, Pacific Grove.
Van Dervort, Edward Paul, Daly City.
Vandeventer, James Charles, Lancaster.
Venuti, Vincent, Jr., Bellflower.
Vesey, Charles Hansen, Napa.
Villalobos, Arthur Garcia, Compton.
Vivilacqua, Theodore R., Long Beach.
Wandro, James Matthew, San Mateo.
Warmbrodt, Jon Frederick, Santa Monica.
Weil, Richard Anthony, Jr., Anaheim.
Weitzel, Kelly Wayne, Spring Valley.
Wells, James Edward, Tulare.
Wilson, Paul, Bakersfield.
Woods, Arthur Lee, Los Angeles.
Woolsey, William Jay, Lancaster.
Wright, Dennis Harold, San Jose.
Wysel, Mitchell Blaine, Ventura.
Young, Carlos Avila, Los Angeles.
Ysguerra, Robert Martin, Union City.
Zumwalt, Edwin Allen, Santa Rosa.

Navy

Angelley, Gerald Dwain, Los Angeles.
Babcock, John Richards, Newport.
Bernstein, Bruce Bryant, Los Angeles.
Brown, Bruce Edward, San Francisco.
Bruckart, Donald Lee, Redlands.
Godines, Mike Mora, Richmond.
Hamman, Lee Thomas, San Gabriel.
Holdredge, David Lee, Los Angeles.
Holmes, Hugh Bryant, Lakewood.
Horrell, Gerald Robert, North Hollywood.
Keller, Richard Leon, Lomita.
Langslow, Robert Malcolm, La Puente.
Lubin, Richard Marc, Beverly Hills.
Luckett, Larry Joe, Pomona.
McKinley, Stephen William, Hilmar.
O'Neil, Robert William, Sunnyvale.
Ollivier, Jose Antonio, Covina.
Pace, Ronald Earl, Los Angeles.
Page, George Merritt, Jr., Santa Monica.
Shapiro, Milton, Palmdale.
Stricklin, Robert Guy, Santa Ana.
Sullivan, John Michael, El Cajon.
Thompson, Robert Alan, Downey.
Wilson, David Allen, South Gate.
Worthington, Robert Leroy, Redondo Beach.

Army

Alvarez, Jose Carmen, Los Angeles.
Anderson, Kenneth Terry, San Diego.
Annis, Robin Richard, Canoga Park.
Arias, Richard, West Sacramento.
Auld, Roger Martin, Jr., Heatherstone.
Baldwin, Larry Dean, San Luis Obispo.
Ballard, Robert Lee, Los Angeles.
Beck, Gregory George, Fullerton.
Bendor, John Lee, Solano.
Bolton, Dennis Lewis, San Bernardino.
Brown, Charles Lynn, Bellflower.
Carlin, David Allen, Eureka.
Case Glenn Edward, Live Oak.
Crilly, David Anthony, Fresno.
Davis, Ray Rene, Oakland.
Davis, Roy Henry, San Luis Obispo.
Donovan, Tommy Clayton, II, Anaheim.
Elbracht, William Michael, Riverside.
Emerson, Wayne Herschel, Santa Susana.
Featherston, Clio C., Jr., Fair Oaks.
Franklin, Jeff Lee, Jr., Los Angeles.
Golliher, Patrick Carl, Granada Hills.
Green, Kish Lemont, Los Angeles.
Grisafe, Michael F., Jr., Covina.
Haberlein, Craig, La Mesa.
Harbord, Anthony Gordon, Beverly Hills.
Harrison, Foster Earl, Los Angeles.
Hayden, William Lyle, Fresno.
Hermosillo, Joseph Refugio, Fullerton.
Hertzler, Richard Dale, Hawthorne.
Higuera, Manuel, Los Angeles.

Howard, Dwane Gene, Pixley.
Huffstutler, Steven Riley, Mentone.
Jenkins, Charles Wayne, Lynwood.
Johnson, Bobby Cal, Oakland.
Kluge, James Donald, Sun Valley.
La Chica, John N., Chula Vista.
Lee, James Allen, San Diego.
Lewis, Harold St. Clair, West Los Angeles.
Lewis, James Robert, Modesto.
Lewis, John Edwin, Rosemead.
Mack, Danny Ray, San Francisco.
Maes, Pedro Miguel, Los Angeles.
Matta, Michael Ernest, Reedly.
Mays, George M., Jr., Compton.
McFarland, Steven Lee, Ventura.
McGovern, Charles Manley, Crestline.
McPherson, Larry Randall, Los Angeles.
Mills, Ted Douglas, Culver City.
Navone, Victor Charles, Jr., Los Altos.
O'Keefe, Robert, William, Davis.
Osuna, Jose Luis, Los Angeles.
Owens, Albert Danny, Mount Shasta.
Pearlstein, Jerrold S., Los Angeles.
Peterson, Stephen Russell, Newhall.
Pigg, Thomas Charles, Carmichael.
Ping, Roy Martin, Compton.
Prather, Lavon Neil, Selma.
Quaglieri, Paul Vincenzo, Burbank.
Quiroz, Alfred Mauro, San Luis Obispo.
Rivera, Julian Cabral, Oxnard.
Romero, Roberto Andress, Fremont.
Ross, Kenneth Edward, Sacramento.
Sicilia, Briggs Kinney, Santa Rosa.
Smith, Ammons Ewing, Jr., Altadena.
Stafford, Philip Clark, Camarillo.
Stanley, Dennis John, Attascadero.
Stotts, James Martin, Fresno.
Thoman, Thedore Vail, Sunnyvale.
Watts, Thomas James, Anaheim.
Wilson, Dean Charles, Alturas.
Wilson, James Willie, Altadena.
Winfrey, Raymond Michael, Redondo Beach.
Woodcock, Steven Jon, Santa Clara.
Yanchuk, Richard Philip, Jr., Canoga Park.

Air Force

Bell, Gerald Dean, San Diego.
Blankenship, Donald Lee, Los Angeles.
Burge, Thomas Guy, Bell.
Cameron, Robert John, Los Angeles.

Marine Corps

Acunia, Edgar, Los Angeles.
Alarcon, Arturo Fragoso, Oakland.
Bell, Mark Wayne, Rodondo Beach.
Boyce, Lawrence Steven, Stockton.
Franks, Barry Richard, Guasti.
Guardado, Rudolph, Los Angeles.
Gutierrez, Raymond Ramirez, La Puente.
Henson, John Michael, Sacramento.
Johnsen, Johnnie Wayne, Hayward.
Leach, James Andrew, Arcadia.
Long, Dan Steven, St. Helena.
Mallobox, Jesse Armando, El Centro.
Massey, Michael Sean, Imperial Beach.
Morris, Herman Ray, Ojai.
Phillips, Ronald Charles, Pittsburg.
Phinn, William Mark, Santa Cruz.
Ramos, Richard, Norwalk.
Rossi, Thomas Louis, Woodland.
Ruiz, Gilbert, San Jose.
Webster, Rhena Charles, Long Beach.
Webster, Wilbert Michael, East Palo Alto.
Williamson, John Clarence, Oakland.

Navy

Dock, Raymond Lee, Jr., San Francisco.
Eckoff, Dale Arnold, Long Beach.
Renning, Richard Andrew, Glen Ellen.
Schimmels, Eddie Ray, Los Angeles.
Siedentopf, Mark, Fremont.
Swigard, Paul Eugene, Jr., Seal Beach.

AUGUST 1, 1969–SEPTEMBER 12, 1969

California

Alvarado, Leonard L., Bakersfield.
Apodaca, Jack M., Lennox.
Baldizon-Izquierdo, Carlos A., San Francisco.
Barrett, Frederick H., Granda Hills.
Bartholomew, Michael M., San Francisco.
Bennett, Douglas A., Sheridan.
Bevard, Bobby L., Santa Clara.
Beverford, Timothy W., Beverly Hills.
Burns, Michael T., San Diego.
Brown, Don C., Garden Grove.
Byrne, James R., Torrance.
Castillo, Thomas, Santa Maria.
Cockerham, John W., Jr., Menlo Park.
Dawson, William J., Redwood City.
Delgado, Jose A., Alhambra.
Di Bari, Louis S., San Jose.
Duenas, Roberto C., San Pedro.
Dugas, Michael J., Carmichael.
Elson, Jeffrey C., Oakland.
Faran, Daniel E., Lawndale.
Field, James R., Los Angeles.
Flores, Jose L., Los Angeles.
Freestone, David E., Rough and Ready.
De Marcus, Jerry D., San Diego.
Gaftunik, Robert E., Sacramento.
Gee, Gregory J., Vallejo.
Goins, Chester L., Pomana.
Gonsalez, Luis M., Perris.
Grant, Melvin L., Oakland.
Grecu, Michael J., San Jose.
Guy, George A., Long Beach.
Guzman, Phillip, Jr., Los Angeles.
Henson, Lesley H., Salinas.
Hernandez, Felipe, Merced.
Hunt, Eugene, Fullerton.
Jackson, Christopher A., San Diego.
Kish, Ernest, Inglewood.
Lahna, Gary W., Long Beach.
McMains, Donald H., Garden Grove.
Major, Robert W., Carmichael.
Masuen, Michael N., Spring Valley.
Mathews, Bernard J., North Hollywood.
Mendenhall, Thomas J., Riverside.
Mills, Peter R., Inglewood.
Mitchell, Robert S., Riverside.
Nazabal, Arturo A., Jr., Los Banos.
Ofstedahl, Jerry W., Napa.
Pearson, George W., Jr., San Diego.
Parra, Manuel F., Los Angeles.
Pierce, Samuel H., Jr., San Francisco.
Poe, Charles A., Baldwin Park.
Ponce, Paul, Santa Clara.
Rawlin, Roy V., Chester.
Reyes, Henry R., Portoville.
Rinehart, Fred G., Arcadia.
Ruffner, Russel M., Jr., La Puente.
Seratte, John S., Fremont.
Schmidt, William J., Mountain View.
Short, Ronald L., Long Beach.
Smith, Phillip C., Pacific Grove.
Tasch, Jon, San Jose.
Taufi, Aouliulitau F., American Samoa.
Tibetts, David R., Santa Ynez.
Tenorio, Jimmy J., Los Angeles.
Velasquez, Charles, Oakland.
Webster, Chritopher C., Bakersfield.
Wecker, Harry H., San Bernardino.
White, Donald H., San Remon.
Williams, Dhaold D., Los Angeles.
Wilson, David H., II, Pacific Grove.
Wolfe, Brian E., Oxnard.
Fregeso, Marco A., Los Angeles.
Landis, Duane G., Spring Valley.
Rivera, Ruben, French Camp.
Rymond, Nicholas J., North Hollywood.
Semans, Thomas E., Norwalk.
Shelton, Richard P., Los Angeles.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, since last Saturday, the Pentagon has notified 12 more California families of the death of a loved one in combat in Vietnam.

Those killed were:

Lance Cpl. Robert R. Baade II, son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert R. Baade, 325 Scott Street, Long Beach.

Capt. Joseph W. Cox, husband of Mrs. Annie M. Cox, 1208 East Avenue, Palmdale.

Pfc. Chester L. Jackson, son of Mr. and Mrs. Earnest Kelly, 2030–11th Street, Riverside.

WO Peter T. Lundberg, son of Mr. and Mrs. Paul A. Lundberg, 3156 Euclid Avenue, Lynwood.

Lance Cpl. Larry D. Ledbetter, husband of Mrs. Sharon Ledbetter, 6148 North Eastbrook, Lakewood.

Lance Cpl. Roger D. Lowery, son of Mr. and Mrs. Ballard A. Lowery, Route 1, Box 177, Arcata.

Pfc. Sherman D. Monk, husband of Mrs. Shelia S. Monk, Box 96, 143277 Delta Road, Los Banos.

Pfc. Patrick O. Moriarity, son of Mr. and Mrs. Arley Moriarty, 11895 Columbet Avenue, San Martin.

Sp4c. James T. Moses, son of Mrs. Marjorie E. Grant, 12129 Fidel Avenue, Whittier.

Pfc. Larry K. Robillard, son of Mr. Lowell K. Robillard, 5539 Norton, Torrance.

Pfc. Jerry V. Ryan, son of Mrs. Betty K. Schlegel, 177 Cragmont Drive, Walnut Creek.

Sgt. Scott N. Stanton, son of Mrs. Florence Stanton, 4807 Woodley, Encino.

They bring to 3,794 the total number of Californians killed in the Vietnam war.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate has just completed 8 weeks of the most serious deliberation on the military authorization bill, and yesterday that bill was passed overwhelmingly in this body. In my opinion, the long days spent on the military authorization bill were time well spent. It was an educational process, so far as the Senate was concerned. It was a process which not only will be beneficial to the future deliberations in this area as well as others in this Chamber, but also, it will prove to be beneficial for the Department of Defense, the administration, and the American people as a whole.

At long last, the Senate has seen fit to face up to its responsibilities; and when I say "the Senate," I include the Committee on Armed Services, as well. I mention the Committee on Armed Services because the chairman of that committee, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), has created several new subcommittees for the purpose of going more specifically into various areas contained in the defense budget.

I would point out that that committee reduced the administration's budget request for the Department of Defense in excess of $2 billion and that it would also have done away with the Cheyenne helicopter contract and the MOL contract if the administration had not acted beforehand. So to that committee I think a word of praise is well merited. To the Senate as a whole, because of the character of the debate, the questions raised, and the deep desire to do something, a word of praise is also due.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excellent article entitled "Military Spending: No Longer a Ritual," written by Arlen J. Large, and published in the Wall Street Journal of today, September 19, 1969.

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

MILITARY SPENDING: NO LONGER A RITUAL

(By Arlen J. Large)

WASHINGTON.—At one point during the Senate's super-long debate on the defense budget, Sen. Howard Cannon was droning through a description of some air force hardware: "The F-111A is equipped with the Mark I avionics costing about $400,000 each."

Sen. Albert Gore of Tennessee: "Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield at that point? I do not quite understand the term 'avionics.' I wonder would the Senator explain that to me?"

Sen. Cannon: "Avionics consist of the sophisticated electronic gear in the aircraft which permits it to carry out its navigational mission, its bombing mission, and so forth. It makes it possible to go to a preselected point and to get there with pinpoint accuracy . . . That is generally referred to in the term of 'avionics.' "

Sen. Gore: "I thank the Senator."

IMPORTANT BYPRODUCTS

So if nothing else, the great anti-Pentagon uprising has been very educational. Mr. Gore will be a better Senator for knowing about avionics, in case it comes up again. And it's clear that the $20 billion defense procurement bill has had other, more important, byproducts as well. For in the course of giving the Defense Department its anti-ballistic missile, its aircraft carrier, its C-5A jet transports and its new strategic bomber, the Senate has said and done things that carry significance beyond decisions on mere weaponry.

It has made vividly clear the Senate's strong streak of isolationism, or neo-isolationism, or whatever is behind a yearning to cut back military involvement abroad. The Air Force got its V-5As and the Navy got its carrier amid assurances from Senate backers that they would reduce the need for both GIs and bases abroad. The White House and State Department aren't compelled to go along with his bring-the-boys-home incursion into foreign policy, but they can't ignore it.

The Senate, for once, has set a healthy example of how Congress should consider the budget. Senators voted for or against each challenged weapon, on its merits, item by item, instead of trying to apply a meat-ax percentage cut in dollars and letting Pentagon bureaucrats decide what to curtail. This is much harder work, requiring the lawmakers to try to inform themselves—and even the public—on defense policy choices. It goes past ritual war-dancing about "Federal spending" to the really critical question: Federal spending *on what?*

The Senate's seven-week defense battle, it should be remembered, arose over a once-routine bill that's passed every year as a legal prelude to the annual appropriation of Pentagon money. The Senate used to dispose of it in a day or two, with interest shown mainly by members of the Armed Services Committee. The mood began to change last year as opposition developed to President Johnson's version of the ABM. President Nixon changed the ABM's physical location and strategic mission in hopes the opposition would die down, but it didn't. Rather, the ABM generated an all-out debate that soon spread to other weapons systems and a general assault on the military's role in American life.

The reason for the wrangle, everyone said, was disillusionment with the Vietnam war. While that's probably true, the war itself was little mentioned during the weaponry debate. Senators instead alternated between discussion of the global big picture and such picky technical matters as the workability of the C-5A's landing gear. Such friends of the military as Sen. Barry Goldwater regarded the whole thing as a towering insult to the Executive branch and the men in uniform. The Arizona Republican complained strenuously about being "exhorted by military amateurs on the finer points of defense strategy and sophisticated weaponry."

An insult to Pentagon pride it may have been, but there also was real blood on the rug before the bill could escape to a friendlier House. President Nixon had asked a $22 billion authorization for military hardware and defense research. The request went routinely to the Senate Armed Services Committee, hitherto the Pentagon's home away from home. But nobody had to hit the committee's new chairman, John Stennis of Mississippi, over the head with an "ABM is an Edsel" poster for him to realize the climate was changing. Mr. Stennis busily formed subcommittees, held some rare hearings in public sessions, and spent days and weeks in deciding how to placate foes in the coming floor battle by means of committee cuts that wouldn't jeopardize, by his lights, the nation's defenses.

His committee chopped the bill by $2 billion. Some of this merely brought the books in line with the Defense Department's last-minute voluntary sacrifice of the manned orbiting laboratory and the Cheyenne helicopter. But the committee also trimmed items the Pentagon badly wants: Cargo ships to be pre-positioned off potentially hostile shores; a new air-to-ground missile; a system of airborne black boxes to detect enemy aircraft; a slew of research projects.

The full Senate cut the bill by an additional $71 million (research, a rainy-day contingency fund), while approving the ABM and other big-thicket items that were challenged. Thus the total Senate cut came close to $2.1 billion, and the Pentagon became one with the Weather Bureau, the anti-poverty office, the ICC and other agencies that must adjust to winning a few and losing a few at budget time.

INTERESTING SIDE-ARGUMENTS

The money ledgers, however, won't record the interesting side-arguments that cropped up around the C-5A jet transport and the Nimitz-class nuclear-powered aircraft carrier. Some of the remarks uttered in the heat of debate should give the willies to State Department big-picture types who had hoped the Senate's pre-Czechoslovakia clamor for withdrawal of some U.S. troop units from Europe wouldn't revive. A devastating debating point occurred to Senators wanting to save the C-5A: "With a fleet of the huge planes available, fewer GIs would be needed overseas and some could even be brought home.

"We cannot continue to bleed this country with this tremendous number of troops stationed all over the world," declared Sen. Richard Russell of Georgia, where the planes are made. "I think we will have to reduce them substantially, and we can, and any weakness coming from that can be remedied by having an adequate airlift capacity."

The aircraft carrier debate evoked demands for scaling back U.S. land bases abroad. Said Sen. Stuart Symington of Missouri: "I would hope that many of these bases in these faraway lands, created to handle a type and character of warfare which will never occur again, are dismantled, so they will no longer be an additional burden on the American taxpayer." Sen George Aiken of Vermont, ranking Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee, argued for the carrier by warning: "The trouble we are having in maintaining bases on foreign soil can easily lead us into another war such as we now have in Vietnam, as well as other difficulties."

Some Senators voted for every one of the proposed defense cuts on the floor; others uniformly voted against them. But, refreshingly, quite a few members sought to look at each weapon as a matter to be settled independently of the others. Sen. Aiken voted against the ABM but for the C-5A and the carrier. GOP Sen. Caleb Boggs of Delaware thought the ABM a good idea, but he supported the additional cuts in military research.

The Defense budget hadn't been treated quite this way in the old days. During the three days of floor action on last year's version of the defense bill, there was a series of unsuccessful attempts to cut individual items. Then just before passage, GOP Sen. John Williams of Delaware arose to propose a 3% cut in the money total, with the decision on what to slice left to the Pentagon. Senators who felt themselves unqualified to judge "the finer points of defense strategy and sophisticated weaponry" knew an economy vote when they saw it, and Mr. Williams' meat-ax slice carried overwhelmingly.

This is the lazy way to combat that ogre, "Federal spending," which the surtax has made even more menacing to politicians. Every opinion poll, every constituent questionnaire, every day's mail last year showed that voters would much rather "cut Federal spending" than suffer the surtax. A legal ceiling on total spending was created to accompany the surtax. Leaky as it is, the ceiling is a rather desperate political response to a clear-cut mood of the voters.

SURRENDERING TO THE EXECUTIVE

But when Congress slaps a lid on a budget statistics, or votes to cut a budget statistic by a certain percent, it's surrendering to Executive branch agencies its right to decide what the Government should do. Anonymous bureaucrats end up with the final say on allocating money among competing Government activities: So much for traffic safety here, so much for new Army mess halls there, no matter what Congress may have appropriated. The bureaucrats undoubtedly are qualified to do it. But their decisions often are made in secret, not revealed until the next annual budget is published. Above all, they aren't accountable to the people, as voters, for these decisions.

A healthy result of this year's unusual public interest in the defense budget controversy has been the determination of Congress to reassert its authority to make these policy choices for the Pentagon. The Senate Armed Services Committee, in reviewing research activities, decided which specific projects would be cut and by how much, declaring that the old days of letting the generals allocate the dollars are over. And this year on the floor no meat-ax percentage cut in the dollar total was even offered; everything had been decided individually.

As Government activities get more complex, there's an unavoidable tendency by both Congress and the public to rely on the experts—not just for legitimate advice, but for decisions. The Government is so vast, its activities so myriad that it's easier just to deplore "Federal spending." What's happened this year on the defense bill is a welcome tug back in the direction of popular self-government.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 7 or 8 minutes.

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

THE NEED FOR IMPROVEMENT IN OUR PRISON SYSTEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the reasons for meting out criminal punishment are given as follows: To punish the offender for his wrongful act; to deter others from committing similar offenses; and to rehabilitate the offender—that is, to convert him into a law-abiding citizen. As well defined as they are, however, it has long been clear that we have failed

miserably in at least one of these endeavors—our effort to rehabilitate. All too often has the criminal served out his prison term, in part for the purpose of rehabilitation, only to be released more embittered, more hardened, and ready at the first opportunity to return to his criminal ways. To say it bluntly, rather than rehabilitate, our prisons too often provide the spawning ground for criminal careers. Rather than conversion, our prisons offer corruption.

In this respect I was greatly impressed by a letter on this subject incorporated into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 12, 1967, by the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN). I think it would be worthwhile at this point to quote again just a few of the impressions of a man who experiences prison life firsthand:

I am a convict, sometimes euphemistically referred to as an "inmate" or "resident." Six years ago, I preyed on people like you, the "square johns." But now I'm in prison. Six years is a long time, and many of you have forgotten me. You have been safe from my depredations for a long time now, and you have forgotten me. But guess what? I'm getting out soon—very soon, and I haven't forgotten you.

I haven't forgotten how you allowed 19th century prisons and prison treatment to remain in the midst of your plenty. I haven't forgotten how you allowed stupid, sometimes brutal men to regulate my life to the nth degree. I haven't forgotten the dehumanization process that makes humanoids out of thinking, feeling human beings. No, I haven't forgotten those miserable things.

But, do I mean you more harm now? Do I plan violent retributions against you? No, I have hurt enough for both of us. Instead, I feel sorry for you. Sorry for the heritage of pain and heartache which you are going to receive from my brothers. Most of my brothers will get out of here just as I am getting out. But many of them are more bitter than I, more resentful, more hating. And they mean you harm. They are going to thump your head for allowing them to be treated as they have been. Can't you see the inevitable consequences of your treatment methods? Can't you learn from experience? If your treatment methods don't work, if you can't think of constructive changes, why don't you copy those that have proved themselves in other penal systems?

Can't you see that change is necessary to preserve what you now have? Can't you see? Are you blind? Are you stupid? Yes, I pity you. My brothers are getting out shortly, and I pity you. I wonder. I sit here in an alien society and I wonder.

I was greatly impressed with this eloquent commentary by one who experiences prison life firsthand. I commend Senator ERVIN for bringing it to the attention of the Senate. In it are expressed the principal criticisms of our penal system; criticisms that have been leveled before and perhaps with more authority, but certainly with no more feeling.

I am appalled and ashamed. We have allowed these conditions to persist. We have failed miserably to correct this blight on our law enforcement process. Rather than curbing crime, our so-called correctional institutions, our jails, prisons, and juvenile facilities merely foster the ever-burgeoning crime rate.

The record is there for all to judge. Earlier this year, the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary concluded exhaustive hearings on our prison system. Laid bare were all the evils, the degradation and despair, the brutality and bitterness that have come to characterize these institutions. I commend this subcommittee for its attention to this matter. I commend its able chairman, the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), for his interest.

A few days ago, the able Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA) introduced S. 2875, a proposal designed to improve these conditions in our correctional systems. Shortly thereafter, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) introduced S. 2905, a companion proposal with similar objectives.

There is no question that this matter deserves our urgent attention. There is no question that action is long overdue. I would hope that the Senate and the Congress would face up to the problem, that all of the proposals would be considered, and that the way to reform would be charted before the 91st Congress adjourns. We can wait no longer.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that my name be added as a cosponsor of S. 2875 and S. 2905.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to ask the distinguished majority leader if he can advise us as to the schedule for the rest of today, and for the rest of the week if there is anything coming after today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished acting minority leader, my long-time friend in both the House and Senate from South Dakota, it is anticipated that we will be able to complete consideration of the pending Space authorization bill today.

After the Space authorization bill is disposed of, we would like to take up today the John F. Kennedy Center bill, Calendar No. 316, H.R. 11249.

It is the intention of the joint leadership, subject to change if conditions occur over which we have no control, that on Monday next, we will take up Calendar No. 416, H.R. 12781, the Interior appropriation bill. Hopefully, we will finish it on that day.

On Tuesday, we will take up the Housing Authority bill as reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

This will be followed on Wednesday, if things go according to Hoyle, by Calendar No. 283, S. 2547, the food stamp bill, which has been pending on the calendar for some time.

This will be followed by the Federal pollution bill out of the Public Works Committee; to be followed by the civil service retirement bill, and then by the Mine Safety Act.

Hopefully, all or most of these will be disposed of next week.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank my distinguished friend from Montana. I take it from that reading that we will try to finish the NASA bill today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, I think the prospects are good, again barring something unforeseen, to complete the bill at a reasonable hour this afternoon.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Is there further morning business?

RED-CARPET TREATMENT OF TRAITOR ROBERT F. WILLIAMS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in common with many other Members of Congress, I was greatly concerned with the red-carpet treatment that was extended to Negro militant Robert F. Williams a few days ago when, after an absence of 8 years from this country as a refugee, during which time, as a citizen of this country, he had done almost everything a traitor can do, he was brought back by a special flight of Transworld Airlines which reportedly cost that fine American institution $20,000.

Mr. President, I do not know why such red-carpet treatment was accorded him. I do not know why he is not being prosecuted now, as I think he should be. I merely invite attention to the fact that I believe this is no way to deal with a traitorous citizen—and that is what he is.

I noted a fine editorial in the Pompano Beach, Fla., Sun-Sentinel of Friday, September 12, 1969, which I think just about hits the nail on the head about this very serious matter which is causing so many Americans great concern.

I must say that I have heard from some very fine Negro citizens that this kind of treatment has caused them concern, because they cannot understand how such treatment could be given to one who has been guilty of such atrocious misconduct, particularly since they have no sympathy whatever for his actions or his attitude, and they are wondering why such treatment should have been accorded him.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial to which I have just referred. It is entitled "Anarchy's Encouraged by Special Treatment." It is a signed editorial, written by a distinguished editorial writer, William A. Mullen.

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

ANARCHY'S ENCOURAGED BY SPECIAL TREATMENT

(By William A. Mullen)

The case of Negro militant Robert F. (Rob) Williams sheds some light on why anarchy threatens the United States and why urban Negro communities are tinder boxes for riots.

After some eight years of exile in Cuba and Red China, from whence he directed propaganda calling upon American Negroes to revolt and advocating that Negro troops in Vietnam murder their White colleagues, Williams is to return to the United States today aboard a special flight costing Trans World Airlines a reported $20,000.

He is getting the very special person treatment at the request of the federal government because TWA would not accept him aboard a regular commercial flight on the grounds that his presence might endanger other passengers.

Moreover, Williams demanded that he be flown back to the United States and would not accept any other means of transportation.

Compliance with his demands to the extent of using a special plane for Williams and his escort will not be lost propaganda to militants who sell the story that the more demands are made, the more stubborn insistence they be met, the more the acquiescence to them.

The significance is all the greater because Williams is no run-of-the-mill militant. He is "chairman in exile" of the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM), a proviolence group, and a leader in the Republic of New Africa (RNA), which proposes that Blacks have a separate nation in Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, Georgia and South Carolina.

The RNA's "Black Legion" has been associated with organizing and training the military-like Black Panthers.

Williams fled to Cuba via the underground railroad from Monroe, N.C., via New York's Harlem and Canada, after a racial disturbance in which he and several followers were accused of shooting a policeman and kidnaping a White couple as hostages.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation described him thusly in a fugitive bulletin: "He has previously been diagnosed as schizophrenic and has advocated and threatened violence. Williams should be considered armed and extremely dangerous."

In his book, Road to Revolution, Phillip Abbott Luce, a former organizer of the "New Left" and of the Progressive Labor party, relates that Williams met with American students who visited Cuba in 1963 and 1964 and in the latter year the PLP was formed. It since has been associated with campus violence and Harlem riots in 1964.

Other sources report that Williams taught the students how to make Molotov cocktails.

Luce attributes these comments to Williams:

"The old method of guerrilla warfare, as carried out from the hills and countryside, would be ineffective in a powerful country like the USA. Any such force would be wiped out in an hour. The new concept creates conditions that involve the total community whether they want to be involved or not. It sustains a state of confusion and destruction of property. It dislocates the organs of harmony and order and reduces central power to the level of a helpless, sprawling octopus. During the hours of the day, sporadic rioting takes place and massive sniping. (sic) Night brings all-out warfare, organized fighting and unlimited terror against the oppressor (Whites) and his forces. . . ."

It was in his magazine, The Crusader, published in Peking, that Williams advocated that Negro troops kill their White comrades at arms. Pamphlets quoting another section of the magazine detailed how to make lye and acid bombs, high-powered sniper rifles and armor-piercing bullets. Thousands of the pamphlets have been found by federal and local authorities throughout the United States.

Throughout his eight years of "exile" as a fugitive indicted for kidnaping. Williams waged a steady attack upon the "racist" United States.

Now he seeks to return to the nation he so viciously castigated and he is due back, as this is written, in high style.

It is another example of how militant leaders of riot and revolution are given special treatment, when they should be handled as dangerous traitors. Such tolerance does little to discourage the anarchy and violence plaguing the nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, without commenting at great length at this time, I do wish to read just enough from the editorial to show how deeply disturbed many good citizens are, because I think the editorial speaks the feelings and concern of many fine citizens of both races and in all parts of the country.

I read the opening paragraphs:

The case of Negro militant Robert F. (Rob) Williams sheds some light on why anarchy threatens the United States and why urban Negro communities are tinder boxes for riots.

After some eight years of exile in Cuba and Red China, from whence he directed propaganda calling upon American Negroes to revolt and advocating that Negro troops in Vietnam murder their White colleagues, Williams is to return to the United States today aboard a special flight costing TransWorld Airlines a reported $20,000.

He is getting the very special person treatment at the request of the federal government because TWA would not accept him aboard a regular commercial flight on the grounds that his presence might endanger other passengers.

Moreover, Williams demanded that he be flown back to the United States and would not accept any other means of transportation.

Mr. President, without reading all of what I have already placed in the RECORD, those parts of the editorial which recite the misconduct of this particular traitor, let me say that I have had this editorial checked by the FBI, and the FBI has assured me that the recitals therein are completely correct where they are quoted, and are substantially correct in other cases.

Without reading the sorry record of Williams' misconduct, I do want to read the closing words of the editorial because I think they so accurately describe the consequences of such treatment of such a person.

I quote:

Throughout his eight years of "exile" as a fugitive indicted for kidnapping, Williams waged a steady attack upon the "racist"—

And that is quoted—

"racist" United States.

Now he seeks to return to the nation he so viciously castigated and he is due back, as this is written, in high style.

It is another example of how militant leaders of riot and revolution are given special treatment, when they should be handled as dangerous traitors. Such tolerance does little to discourage the anarchy and violence plaguing the nation.

Mr. President, I could not be more thoroughly in accord with the position taken in this editorial. I hope that our Government may seriously consider what is its duty in such a case, and in this particular case, and in view of the printed statements—the printed signed statements—which have appeared in the various places cited in this editorial, given out by this particular traitor to our country.

I hope that our country may learn that it is not in such soft treatment of such a person that there resides any assurance that our country can continue to exist and can meet these traitorous activities and can protect and preserve this Nation and its law-abiding citizens—and that phrase includes most of our white people and most of our Negro people.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. I would like to join in the remarks of the Senator. I was shocked in reading the treatment that was accorded this individual. I think if the Federal Government was a party to it—and it obviously was—whoever had that responsibility should certainly review that action with relation to any prospective action in the future. I think it is shocking that such treatment would be given to a man who is accused of the type of crime this man is accused of. I think he should have been brought back by the most expeditious means, under the heaviest guard, and not under the circumstances related.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thoroughly agree with the distinguished Senator from Nevada, and I appreciate so much his comments.

I have wondered why there has not been more notice taken of this particular situation, which causes me, and I know from what has come to me, many others, deepest concern. I suspect that the reason why it has been shown so little attention in the Senate is the pendency of the bill which we had been debating for over 2 months and upon which we concluded action yesterday, and which was of the greatest importance to our country to conclude without great damage being done to it, and to protect the program which is embraced in that particular bill for the security of our country.

I hope that is the reason why we have not had more reference to this particular situation. I hope that now we may hear from whatever Federal authorities they were that arranged this special red-carpet trip of Williams to return to our country as the sole passenger in a large commercial plane. I hope that those Federal authorities will give some sort of reasonable explanation, if there is any—some sort of explanation, even if it is not reasonable—so that our people who

are so deeply concerned about this incident may know what is going on in this connection.

I thank the Senator from Nevada for his remarks.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PROPOSED LEGISLATION ENLARGING THE CLASSES OF PERSONS ELIGIBLE FOR SERVICEMEN'S GROUP LIFE INSURANCE

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to enlarge the classes of persons eligible for Servicemen's Group Life Insurance, and to improve the administration of the program (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Economic Assistance Funds improperly used to finance vehicles for defense requirements, Agency For International Development, Department of State, dated September 18, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on progress and problems relating to improvement of Federal agency accounting systems as of December 31, 1968, dated September 18, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING THE TRANSFER OF THE BROWN UNIT OF THE FORT BELKNAP INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the transfer of the Brown Unit of the Fort Belknap Indian Irrigation Project on the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, Mont., to the landowners within the unit (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LOAN APPLICATION BY THE WATER SUPPLY AND STORAGE CO., FORT COLLINS, COLO.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a loan application by the Water Supply and Storage Co. of Fort Collins, Colo. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LOAN APPLICATION BY ST. JOHN IRRIGATION CO., OF MALAD, IDAHO

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a loan application by the St. John Irrigation Co. of Malad, Idaho (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the Acting President pro tempore:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"RESOLUTION 56

"Whereas, the City of Huntsville, Alabama, is known and recognized as the "Space Capital of the World," because of the outstanding developments in space travel made there; and

"Whereas, the City of Huntsville, Alabama, has not been the recipient of a commemorative postage stamp in recognition of its achievements.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Legislature of Alabama, both Houses thereof concurring, That we call on the United States Post Office Department to issue a 10¢ airmail commemorative postage stamp, commemorating the Apollo 11 moon landing flight, in the City of Huntsville, Alabama, at a time to be determined by said Post Office Department.

"Be it further resolved That the appropriate authorities take note of the fact that the Saturn booster rocket which: made all the Apollo flights possible is a Huntsville development, and that the scientists and workers of said city deserve recognition along with other space heroes; and

"Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Postmaster General of the United States, the Director of the Division of Philately—U.S. Post Office Department, each member of our U.S. Senate and Congressional delegation, and the Huntsville Chamber of Commerce.

"Attest:

"MCDOWELL LEE,
Secretary of Senate."

A resolution adopted by the New Shrewsbury Borough Council, of Red Bank, N.J. urging that the Military Construction Authorization bill be amended to include Fort Monmouth as a customer of the Northeast Monmouth County Regional Sewerage Authority; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Stanton, Calif., remonstrating against any proposed expansion of the Los Alamitos Naval Air Station; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the County of Monroe, N.Y., praying for the enactment of legislation on welfare reform and improved revenue sharing; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from Sheldon Kirzer, of Jersey City, N.J., remonstrating against proposed cut in funding of the Institute of General Medical Sciences of the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 2931. A bill to provide for the sale of land in Clark County, Nev.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(The remarks of Mr. CANNON when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. DODD:

S. 2932. A bill to amend the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. DODD when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. MATHIAS:

S. 2933. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Migliaccio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 2934. A bill for the relief of Dr. Amnach Sriratanaban; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2935. A bill for the relief of Patricia C. LiBassi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2936. A bill to provide for the compensation of persons injured by certain criminal acts in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(The remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. HARRIS:

S. 2937. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of Jim Thorpe; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2938. A bill for the relief of Virginia Villa (A14 993 668); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HART, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. PELL, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SAXBE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 2939. A bill to provide for the modernization of railroad passenger equipment in order to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the National Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(The remarks of Mr. TYDINGS when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. MATHIAS (for himself, Mr. SPONG, Mr. GOODELL, and Mr. SCHWEIKER):

S.J. Res. 153. Joint resolution to establish a commission upon the condition and future of American policy respecting all aspects of international trade and tariffs; to the Committee on Finance.

(The remarks of Mr. MATHIAS when he introduced the joint resolution appear later in the RECORD under an appropriate heading.)

S. 2931—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE SALE OF LAND IN CLARK COUNTY, NEV.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the sale of land in Clark County, Nev., in order to correct a potentially unfair situation.

The affected purchaser, in good faith, purchased the land 20 years ago, and, assuming she held proper title, fulfilled her obligation to the best of her ability by faithfully paying the required taxes on and caring for the property for those many years.

To achieve fairness for both the Federal Government and the bona fide purchaser, this bill provides for the purchase of the land at the fair market value as of April 30, 1949, the date of the original purchase. Such a provision, I feel, provides for the conveyance without giving the purchaser a windfall, and at the same time denies the Government a windfall by allowing her to retain the benefit of the faithfully paid taxes and her care and improvement of the land during the 20-year period.

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

The bill (S. 2931) to provide for the sale of land in Clark County, Nev., introduced by Mr. CANNON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2932—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO EMBARGO THE DOMESTIC PRODUCTION, SALE AND DELIVERY OF CERTAIN FIREARMS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, an amendment to the Gun Control Act of 1968.

The effect of this amendment would be to prevent the transfer or sale by a licensee of any firearm other than a rifle or shotgun to anyone unless the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the weapon is suitable for lawful sporting purposes.

The standards he would apply to such firearms are the same as those applied to foreign imports which are covered by the Gun Control Act.

I have attached to my statement a copy of the factoring standards developed jointly by the Internal Revenue Service and a group of domestic firearms experts, and excerpts of the import regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Treasury to implement the act.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment, the documents entitled "Internal Revenue Service Factoring Criteria for Revolvers" and "Excerpts From Title 26—Internal Revenue—Chapter 1, Subchapter E—Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Excise Taxes, Part 178—Commerce in Firearms and Ammunition," published in the Federal Register December 14, 1968, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DODD. The basic purpose of the amendment is to provide an added measure of safety to the American people by restricting the sales of so-called Saturday night special pistols and revolvers that are now being produced by the tens of thousands in the United States.

Mr. President, I should explain that "Saturday night specials" are inexpensive, poorly made handguns whose only purpose is to terrorize prospective robbery victims.

Mr. William Cahalan, the prosecuting attorney of Wayne County, Mich., testified before the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee just a few days before the disastrous Detroit riot and described the massive flow of these weapons from Toledo into the city of Detroit. Cahalan said that many minor hoodlums in Detroit who wanted to commit armed robbery would purchase one of these pistols immediately prior to the crime. And because most armed robberies take place on Saturday night, Michigan authorities dubbed them "Saturday night specials."

During our hearings we found this situation was not unique to the city of Detroit. The term "Saturday night special" had spread to every section of the country. We have found that this is the weapon most used not only in the crime of robbery but in the crime of murder and assault as well.

When the Gun Control Act was enacted last fall, provisions of that law prohibited the importation into the United States of these deadly weapons. That prohibition was based on a 7-year record of documented abuse of these so-called belly guns, whose only purpose was to kill or maim human beings.

These weapons are useless as hunting or sporting weapons.

Virtually every law enforcement officer who appeared before the subcommittee urged us to ban the importation of these multiple murder-a-day guns. They told us that such weapons had no legitimate sporting use and that their basic function was to be used as a "manstopper."

Even the National Rifle Association made this judgment on these weapons.

Case after case of abuse of these weapons was made available to us and the record that was compiled convinced me of the need to restrict their importation as a means of insuring the safety and well-being of our citizens.

Our own staff investigations and inquiries proved that the flood of these deadly "manstoppers" was a serious contributing factor to our spiraling crime rate and in particular to the sharp increase in gun crimes in the United States. Since our investigation began in 1961, there were over 3½ million of these lethal weapons imported, most of which were sold by mail order .

The weapons in question were small caliber, easily concealed, and readily available. Until enactment of the Gun Control Act they were imported, transported, and shipped by common carrier, virtually without control either by mail order or over the counter to nonresidents.

Mr. President, as you know these two sources of guns for criminals have been blocked with the enactment of the 1968 act.

However, there is in this country a cataclysmic lack of adequate State firearms controls.

The crime problems which result from this lack of State controls are increasingly being compounded by the fact that the former importers of the "Saturday night specials," the guns that law-enforcement officials from throughout the land urged be banned from import, have become domestic manufacturers. These "fast-buck" artists are now producing an American version of the "Saturday night special" which sells at prices comparable to the imported weapons.

The question that now confronts us is a simple one.

Are we going to allow the domestic production and sale of millions of nonsporting killer guns which are used in 30 percent of our murders annually, or are we going to move now, to stop their being dumped into the domestic arms traffic.

In my judgment we must act immediately.

The major importer of the "Saturday night special" of recent years is located in Miami, Fla. He has recently converted a church into a gun factory and is now producing hundreds of thousands of a domestic version of the very gun which he formerly imported into the United States.

This importer was the main reason for the import provisions in the Gun Control Act of 1968. He now claims:

> In a few years we'll be one of the biggest manufacturers of handguns . . . in the United States.

The handguns to which he refers are the American "Saturday night special."

Dade County police officials have said that 30 to 40 percent of the homicides in the country are committed with the type of gun sold by this "gunrunner." These same police officials are quoted as saying these guns "are popular particularly in the lower income groups where kids 14 and 15 and 16 are carrying guns."

E. G. Bigler of the Dade crime lab ballistics division indicated that these Florida manufactured guns are causing him problems because of the lack of craftsmanship. Bigler stated:

> The cylinder is free-turning and sometimes the bullet shaves off the right side, sometimes the left side. They are very hard to run tests on.

These sentiments are not peculiar to law-enforcement officers in Florida. The subcommittee's hearing records are replete with testimony documenting the abuses of this gunrunner's products in crimes of violence across America.

But he is not the only producer of these weapons.

Others are producing their own versions of the "Saturday night special" in substantial quantities. The gun is comparable in size and capability to the foreign imports which have been embargoed, because of their record of abuse.

While the record has not yet crystallized with regard to these domestically manufactured small caliber weapons, it seems clear to me that if action is not taken as a preventive measure now, then there is every possibility that the same patterns of abuse that developed with regard to the foreign imported firearms will occur with the comparable domestically produced gun.

Recent testimony by members of the Justice and Treasury Departments contained ominous statements on projected production figures by a few U.S. entrepreneurs who are trying to make a fast buck by filling in the void which was created when we blocked the European gunrunners.

Mr. Donald Santarelli, Associate Deputy Attorney General, testified that some 60,000 inexpensive, domestically manufactured "Saturday night specials" were made in the United States in 1968.

Santarelli went on to say that in 1969 it is estimated that 700,000 of these weapons will be manufactured here, and that by 1970 fully 1 million of these "pot metal" killer guns will be produced.

Santarelli concluded that the problem caused by the Saturday night specials has not abated, but, in fact, has exacerbated.

Representatives of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence in a statement before the subcommittee called for an extension of the Gun Control Act to actually prohibit the domestic production of these junk guns.

Mr. President, I would rather approach this entire firearms problem from another standpoint. I would much

prefer that the States enact enforceable and effective controls and that local levels of government insure that only responsible, lawful Americans purchase firearms.

However, we all know that such a condition will not exist in this country in the near future.

The only alternative is the enactment of comprehensive Federal registration and licensing controls.

Unfortunately, this approach is also far removed from reality.

Today, we are faced with a real and pressing decision that must be made with regard to the potential abuse of the weapons that I have just described in my remarks.

Are we to wait for a rash of killings, assaults, and armed robberies with these weapons, before we act?

I should hope not.

We must act decisively and we must act now.

We must enact this measure that I introduce today if we are to prevent the thousands of tragedies that would be inevitable if we failed to act.

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. 2932) to amend the Gun Control Act of 1968, introduced by Mr. DODD, 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. 2932

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Section 922(b) of The Gun Control Act of 1968 is amended by—

(1) striking out at the end of paragraph 4 thereof the word "and";

(2) striking out at the end of paragraph 5 of such Section the period and inserting in lieu thereof a semi-colon and the word "and"; and,

(3) adding after paragraph 5 thereof: "any firearm, other than a rifle or shotgun, to any person, which the Secretary determines to be unsuitable for lawful sporting purposes based upon standards established by him pursuant to Section 925(d) of this title."

EXHIBIT 1

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE FACTORING CRITERIA FOR REVOLVERS

Individual characteristics of weapon	Factor allowance	Value	Subtotal (points)
Barrel length (muzzle to cylinder face)	Less than 4 inches	0	
	For each ¼ over 4 inches	½	
Frame construction	Forged steel	15	
	Forged HTS alloy	20	
Weapon weight (unloaded)	Per ounce	1	
Caliber	22 short to 25 ACP	0	
	22LR and 30 to 38 S. & W	3	
	38 special	4	
	357 magnum and over	5	
Miscellaneous equipment	Adjustable target sights (drift or click)	5	
	Target grips	5	
	Target hammer and target trigger	5	

Prerequisites:
1. Must pass safety test.
2. Must have overall frame (with conventional grips) length (not diagonal) of 4½ inches minimum.
3. Must have a barrel length of at least 3 inches.

Safety test: A double action revolver must have a safety feature which automatically (or in a single action revolver by manual operation) causes the hammer to retract to a point where the firing pin does not rest upon the primer of the cartridge. The safety device must withstand the impact of a weight equal to the weight of the revolver dropping from a distance of 36 inches in a line parallel to the barrel upon the rear of the hammer spur, a total of 5 times.

Qualifying score is 45 points.
Revolver model..... Score achieved.....

Note: The Internal Revenue Service reserves the right to preclude importation of any revolver which achieves an apparent qualifying score but does not adhere to the provisions of sec. 925(d)(3) of amended ch. 44, title 18, United States Code.

EXCERPTS FROM TITLE 26—INTERNAL REVENUE—CHAPTER 1, SUBCHAPTER E—ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, AND OTHER EXCISE TAXES—PART 178—COMMERCE IN FIREARMS AND AMMUNITION

SUBPART G—IMPORTATION

§ 178.111 General

(a) Section 922(a)(3) of the Act makes it unlawful, with certain exceptions not pertinent here, for any person other than a licensee, to transport into or receive in the State where he resides any firearm purchased or otherwise obtained by him outside of that State. However, section 925(a)(4) provides a limited exception for the transportation, shipment, receipt or importation of certain firearms and ammunition by certain members of the United States armed forces. Section 922(1) of the Act makes it unlawful for any person knowingly to import or bring into the United States or any possession thereof any firearm or ammunition except as provided by section 925(d) of the Act, which section provides standards for importing or bringing firearms or ammunition into the United States. Accordingly, no firearm or ammunition may be imported or brought into the United States except as provided by this part.

(b) Where a firearm or ammunition is imported and the authorization for importation required by this subpart has not been obtained by the person importing same, such person shall:

(1) Store, at his expense, such firearm or ammunition at a facility designated by U.S. Customs or the Assistant Regional Commissioner to await the issuance of the required authorization or other disposition; or

(2) Abandon such firearm or ammunition to the U.S. Government; or

(3) Export such firearm or ammunition.

(c) Any inquiry relative to the provisions or procedures under this subpart, other than that pertaining to the payment of customs duties or the release from Customs custody of firearms or ammunition authorized by the Director to be imported, shall be directed to the Assistant Regional Commissioner for reply.

§ 178.112 Importation by a licensed importer

(a) No firearm or ammunition shall be imported or brought into the United States by a licensed importer (as defined in § 178.11) unless the Director has authorized the importation of the firearm or ammunition, or the firearm or ammunition is listed on the Importation List compiled by the Director as provided by paragraph (c) of this section.

(b) An application for a permit, Form 6 (Firearms), to import or bring a firearm or ammunition into the United States or a possession thereof under this section shall be filed, in triplicate, with the Director. The application shall contain (1) the name, address, and license number of the importer, (2) a description of the firearm or ammunition to be imported, including type (e.g.: rifle, shotgun, pistol, revolver), model, caliber, size or gauge, barrel length (if a firearm), country of manufacture, and name of the manufacturer, (3) the unit cost of the firearm to be imported, (4) the country from which to be imported, (5) the name and address of the foreign seller and the foreign shipper, (6) verification that if a firearm, it will be identified as required by this part, and (7) (i) if imported or brought in for scientific or research purposes, a statement describing such purposes, or (ii) if for use in connection with competition or training pursuant to chapter 401 of title 10, U.S.C., a statement describing such intended use, or (iii) if an unserviceable firearm (other than a machine gun) being imported as a curio or museum piece, a description of how it was rendered unserviceable and an explanation of why it is a curio or museum piece, or (iv) if a firearm, other than a surplus military firearm, of a type that does not fall within the definition of a firearm by section 5845(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and is for sporting purposes, an explanation of why the applicant believes the firearm is generally recognized as particularly suitable for or readily adaptable to sporting purposes, or (v) if ammunition being imported for sporting purposes, a statement why the applicant believes it is generally recognized as particularly suitable for or readily adaptable to sporting purposes. In determining whether a firearm or ammunition is particularly suitable for or readily adaptable to sporting purposes, the Director may seek the recommendation of the advisory board authorized by paragraph (c) of this section. If the Director approves the application, such approved application shall serve as the permit to import the firearms or ammunition described therein, and importation of such firearms or ammunition may continue to be made by the licensed importer under the approved application (permit) during the period specified thereon. The Director shall furnish the approved application (permit) to the applicant and retain two copies thereof for administrative use. If the Director disapproves the application, the licensed importer shall be notified of the basis for the disapproval.

(c) The Director may compile an Importation List of firearms and ammunition which he determines to be generally recognized as particularly suitable for or readily adaptable to sporting purposes. The determination of the Director that a firearm or ammunition is generally recognized to be particularly suitable for or readily adaptable to sporting purposes may be made with the assistance of an advisory board to be appointed by the Commissioner. Such board may be composed of persons from within and without governmental agencies who are recognized as being particularly knowledgeable in the use and classification of firearms and ammunition. No firearm shall be placed on the Importation List unless it is found that (1) the caliber or gauge of the firearm is suitable for use in a recognized shooting sport, (2) the type of firearm is generally recognized as particularly suitable for or readily adaptable to such use, and (3) the use of the firearm in a recognized shooting sport will not en-

danger the person using it due to deterioration through such use or because of inferior workmanship, materials or design. No ammunition shall be placed on the Importation List unless it is found that (i) the caliber, size or gauge of the ammunition is suitable for use in a recognized shooting sport, (ii) the type of ammunition is generally recognized as particularly suitable for or readily adaptable to such use, and (iii) the use of the ammunition in a recognized shooting sport will not endanger the person using it.

(d) A firearm or ammunition imported or brought into the United States by a licensed importer may be released from Customs custody to the licensed importer upon his showing that he has obtained a permit from the Director for the importation of the firearm or ammunition to be released, or that the firearm or ammunition appears on the Importation List. In obtaining the release from Customs custody of a firearm or ammunition authorized by this section to be imported through use of a permit or because the firearm or ammunition appears on the Importation List, the licensed importer shall prepare Form 6A (Firearms), in duplicate, and furnish the original Form 6A (Firearms) to the Customs officer releasing the firearm or ammunition. The Customs officer shall, after certification, forward the Form 6A (Firearms) to the Assistant Regional Commissioner for the region wherein the licensed importer maintains his place of business. The Form 6A (Firearms) shall show the name, address, and license number of the importer, the name of the manufacturer of the firearm or ammunition, the country of manufacture, the type, model, and caliber, size or gauge, and the number of firearms or rounds of ammunition released.

(e) Within 15 days of the date of release from Customs custody, the licensed importer shall (1) forward to the Assistant Regional Commissioner a copy of Form 6A (Firearms) on which shall be reported any error of discrepancy appearing on the Form 6A (Firearms) certified by Customs, (2) pursuant to § 178.92, place all required identification data on each imported firearm if same did not bear such identification data at the time of its release from Customs custody, and (3) post in the records required to be maintained by him under Subpart H of this part, all required information regarding the importation.

§ 178.113 Importation by other licensees

(a) No person other than a licensed importer (as defined in § 178.11) shall engage in the business of importing firearms or ammunition. Therefore, no firearm or ammunition shall be imported or brought into the United States or a possession thereof by any licensee other than a licensed importer unless the Director issues a permit authorizing the importation of the firearm or ammunition.

(b) An application for a permit, Form 6 (Firearms), to import or bring a firearm or ammunition into the United States or a possession thereof by a licensee, other than a licensed importer, shall be filed, in triplicate, with the Director. The application shall contain (1) the name, address, and the license number of the applicant, (3) a description of the firearm or ammunition to be imported, including type (e.g.: rifle, shotgun, pistol, revolver), model, caliber, size or gauge, barrel length (if a firearm), country of manufacture, and name of the manufacturer, (3) the unit cost of the firearm or ammunition to be imported, (4) the name and address of the foreign seller and the foreign shipper, (5) the country from which the firearm or ammunition is to be imported, and (6) (i) if the firearm or ammunition is being imported or brought in for scientific or research purposes, a statement describing such purposes, or (ii) if for use in connection with competition or training pursuant to chapter 401 of title 10, U.S.C., a statement describing such intended use, or (iii) if an unserviceable firearm (other than a machine gun) being imported as a curio or museum piece, a description of how it was rendered unserviceable and an explanation of why it is a curio or museum piece, or (iv) if a firearm, other than a surplus military firearm, of a type that does not fall within the definition of a firearm under 5845(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and is for sporting purposes, an explanation of why the applicant believes the firearm is generally recognized as particularly suitable for or readily adaptable to sporting purposes, or (v) if ammunition being imported for sporting purposes, a statement why the applicant believes it is generally recognized as particularly suitable for or readily adaptable to sporting purposes. If the Director approves the application, such approved application shall serve as the permit to import the firearm or ammunition described therein. The Director shall furnish the approved application (permit) to the applicant and retain two copies thereof for administrative use. If the Director disapproves the application, the applicant shall be notified of the basis for the disapproval.

(c) A firearm or ammunition imported or brought into the United States or a possession thereof under the provisions of this section may be released from Customs custody to the licensee importing the firearm or ammunition upon his showing that he has obtained a permit from the Director for the importation. In obtaining the release of the firearm or ammunition from Customs custody, the licensee importing same shall furnish a Form 6A (Firearms) to the Customs officer releasing the firearm or ammunition. The Customs officer shall, after certification, forward the Form 6A (Firearms) to the Assistant Regional Commissioner for the region wherein the licensee importing the firearm or ammunition maintains his licensed premises. The Form 6A (Firearms) shall show the name, address, and the license number of the licensee, the name of the manufacturer, the country of manufacture, and the type, model, and caliber, size (if ammunition) or gauge of the firearm or ammunition so released, and, if applicable, the number of firearms or rounds of ammunition released.

§ 178.114 Importation by members of the U.S. Armed Forces

(a) The Director may issue a permit authorizing the importation of a firearm or ammunition into the United States to the place of residence of any military member of the U.S. Armed Forces who is on active duty outside the United States, or who has been on active duty outside the United States within the 60-day period immediately preceding the intended importation: *Provided,* That such firearm or ammunition is generally recognized as particularly suitable for or readily adaptable to sporting purposes and is intended for the personal use of such member. An application for such a permit, Form 6 (Firearms), shall be filed, in triplicate, with the Director. The application shall contain (1) the name and current address of the applicant, (2) certification that the transportation, receipt, or possession of the firearm or ammunition to be imported would not constitute a violation of any provision of the Act, Title VII of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended (82 Stat. 236; 18 U.S.C. Appendix), or of any State law or local ordinance at the place of the applicant's residence, (3) a description of the firearm or ammunition to be imported, including type (e.g.: rifle, shotgun, pistol, revolver), model, caliber, size or gauge, barrel length (if a firearm), country of manufacture, and the name of the manufacturer, (4) the unit cost of the firearm or ammunition to be imported, (5) the name and address of the foreign seller (if applicable) and the foreign shipper, (6) the country from which the firearm or ammunition is to be imported, (7) (i) that the firearm or ammunition being imported is for the personal use of the applicant, and (ii) if a firearm, a statement that it is not a surplus military firearm, that it does not fall within the definition of a firearm under section 5845(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and an explanation of why the applicant believes the firearm is generally recognized as particularly suitable for or readily adaptable to sporting purposes, or (iii) if ammunition, a statement why the applicant believes it is generally recognized as particularly suitable for or readily adaptable to sporting purposes, and (8) the applicant's date of birth, his rank or grade, his place of residence, his present foreign duty station or his last foreign duty station, as the case may be, the date of his reassignment to a duty station within the United States, if applicable, and the military branch of which he is a member. If the Director approves the application, such approved application shall serve as the permit to import the firearm or ammunition described therein. The Director shall furnish the approved application (permit) to the applicant and shall retain the two copies thereof for administrative purposes. If the Director disapproves the application, the applicant shall be notified of the basis for the disapproval.

(b) Upon receipt of an approved application (permit) to import the firearm or ammunition, the applicant may obtain the release of same from Customs custody upon his showing that he has obtained a permit from the Director for the importation. In obtaining the release of the firearm or ammunition from Customs custody, the military member of the U.S. Armed Forces importing same shall furnish a Form 6A (Firearms) to the Customs officer releasing the firearm or ammunition. The Customs officer shall, after certification, forward the Form 6A (Firearms) to the Assistant Regional Commissioner for the region wherein the State of residence of the military member of the U.S. Armed Forces is located. The Form 6A (Firearms) shall show the name and address of such military member, the name of the manufacturer, the country of manufacture, and the type, model, and caliber, size or gauge of the firearm or ammunition so released, and, if applicable, the number of firearms or rounds of ammunition released. However, when such military member is on active duty outside the United States, he may appoint, in writing, an agent to obtain the release of the firearm or ammunition from Customs custody for him. Such agent shall present sufficient identification of himself and the written authorization to act on behalf of such military member to the Customs officer who is to release the firearm or ammunition.

(c) Firearms determined by the Department of Defense to be war souvenirs may be imported into the United States by the military members of the U.S. Armed Forces under such provisions and procedures as the Department of Defense may issue.

§ 178.115 Exempt importation

(a) Firearms and ammunition may be brought into the United States or any possession thereof by any person who can establish to the satisfaction of Customs that such firearm or ammunition was previously taken out of the United States or any possession thereof by such person. Registration on Customs Form 4457 or on any other registration document available for this purpose may be completed before departure from the United States at any J.S. customhouse or any office of an Assistant Regional Commissioner. A bill of sale or other commercial document showing transfer of the firearm or ammuni-

tion in the United States to such person also may be used to establish proof that the firearm or ammunition was taken out of the United States by such person. Firearms and ammunition furnished under the provisions of section 925(a)(3) of the Act to military members of the U.S. Armed Forces on active duty outside of the United States also may be imported into the United States or any possession thereof by such military members upon establishing to the satisfaction of Customs that such firearms and ammunition were so obtained.

(b) Firearms and ammunition may be imported or brought into the United States by or for the United States or any department or agency thereof, or any State or any department, agency, or political subdivision thereof. A firearm or ammunition imported or brought into the United States under this paragraph may be released from Customs custody upon a showing that the firearm or ammunition is being imported or brought into the United States by or for such a governmental entity.

(c) The provisions of this subpart shall not apply with respect to the importation into the United States of any antique firearm.

(d) Firearms and ammunition are not imported into the United States, and the provisions of this subpart shall not apply, when such firearms and ammunition are brought into the United States by:

(1) A non-resident of the United States for legitimate hunting or lawful sporting purposes, and such firearms and such ammunition as remains following such shooting activity are to be taken back out of the territorial limits of the United States by such person upon conclusion of the shooting activity;

(2) Foreign military personnel on official assignment to the United States who bring such firearms or ammunition into the United States for their exclusive use while on official duty in the United States;

(3) Official representatives of foreign governments who are accredited to the U.S. Government or are en route to or from other countries to which accredited;

(4) Officials of foreign governments and distinguished foreign visitors who have been so designated by the Department of State; and

(5) Foreign law enforcement officers of friendly foreign governments entering the United States on official law enforcement business.

§ 178.116 Conditional importation

The Director may permit the conditional importation or bringing into the United States or any possession thereof of any firearm or ammunition for the purpose of examining and testing the firearm or ammunition in connection with making a determination as to whether the importation or bringing in of such firearm or ammunition will be authorized under this part. An application for such conditional importation shall be filed, in duplicate, with the Director. The Director may impose conditions upon any importation under this section including a requirement that the firearm or ammunition be shipped directly from Customs custody to the Director and that the person importing or bringing in the firearm or ammunition must agree to either export the firearm or ammunition or destroy same if a determinatian is made that the firearm or ammunition may not be imported or brought in under this part. A firearm or ammunition imported or brought into the United States or any possession thereof under the provisions of this section shall be released from Customs custody upon the payment of customs duties, if applicable, and in the manner prescribed in the conditional authorization issued by the Director.

§ 178.117 Function outside a customs territory

In the insular possessions of the United States outside customs territory, the functions performed by U.S. Customs officers under this subpart within a customs territory may be performed by the appropriate authorities of a territorial government or other officers of the United States who have been designated to perform such functions. For the purpose of this subpart, the term customs territory means the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

S. 2936—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO CREATE A DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA VIOLENT CRIME COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to compensate victims of crime in the District of Columbia. Briefly, this bill would create a three-man Commission appointed by the President with the advise and consent of the Senate. This Commission would be empowered to hear applications from victims of crime for compensation. Upon determining that the application is valid, the Commission could order the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to pay up to $25,000 to the victim of a crime or to victim's survivors where murder is involved.

Under the provisions of this act, crimes for which compensation could be claimed are:

First. Arson.

Second. Assault.

Third. Assault with intent to kill, rob, or rape and attempt to poison.

Fourth. Indecent act with children.

Fifth. Assault with intent to commit mayhem or with dangerous weapon.

Sixth. Kidnaping.

Seventh. Lewd, indecent, or obscene acts.

Eighth. Manslaughter.

Ninth. Murder.

Tenth. Negligent homicide.

Eleventh. Rape.

Twelfth. Robbery.

Thirteenth. Unauthorized use of vehicles.

Fourteenth. Or other crimes involving force to the person.

Mr. President, one of the most shameful blot on our Capitol is the high and steadily rising rate of crime here. The concern which many people are showing over this situation is well justified and I share this concern.

But, we must see crime in terms of a three-part equation: The conditions of life that produce a criminal act, the criminal act itself, and the victim's loss. At the moment, our major resources center upon the act of the criminal. Surely we owe as much assistance and concern to the victim of a violent crime as we do to his attacker.

Society's responsibility to the victims of crimes of violence is directly related to society's dereliction in fulfilling its responsibilities for preserving law and order within the society. Unlike an earlier time in our history when citizens bore arms and largely were responsible for their own protection, various laws, institutions, and mores within today's social structure exist as a pledge that society will provide protection. When society fails in its assumed duty to protect its citizens, society ought to have the responsibility of compensating the innocent victim for his personal pain and injury.

I believe that my bill, which I am introducing today, contains provisions that make it an important stepping stone in dealing with this urgent matter. I have given its passage top priority, and I hope that it will receive early consideration by the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill to provide for compensation be printed in full 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. 2936) to provide for the compensation of persons injured by certain criminal acts in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2936

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

TITLE I—SHORT TITLE AND DEFINITIONS

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 101. This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Criminal Injuries Compensation Act".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 102. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "child" means an unmarried person who is under eighteen years of age and includes a stepchild, an adopted child;

(2) The term "Commission" means the District of Columbia Violent Crimes Compensation Commission established by this Act;

(3) The term "dependents" means those who were wholly or partially depending upon his income at the time of his death or would have been so dependent but for the incapacity due to the injury from which the death resulted and shall include the child of such victim born after his death;

(4) The term "personal injury" means actual bodily harm and includes pregnancy and mental or nervous shock;

(5) The term "relative" means the spouse, parent, grandparent, stepfather, stepmother, child, grandchild, brother, sister, half brother, or half sister of the victim;

(6) The term "victim" means a person who is injured or killed by any act or omission of any other person which is within the description of any of the offenses specified in section 302 of this Act.

TITLE II—ESTABLISHMENT OF VIOLENT CRIMES COMPENSATION COMMISSION

VIOLENT CRIMES COMPENSATION COMMISSION

SEC. 201. (a) There is established a District of Columbia Violent Crimes Compensation Commission which shall be composed of three members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate solely on the grounds of fitness to perform the duties of the office. The President shall designate one of the members of the Commission who has been a member of the bar of a Federal court or of

the highest court of a State for at least eight years as Chairman.

(b) No member of the Commission shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(c) The Chairman and one other member of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, except as provided in section 205 (b); and where opinion is divided and only one other member is present, the opinion of the Chairman shall prevail.

(d) The Commission shall have an official seal.

TERMS AND COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

SEC. 202. (a) The term of office of each member of the Commission taking office after December 31, 1969, shall be eight years, except that (1) the terms of office of the members first taking office after December 31, 1969, shall expire as designated by the President at the time of the appointment, one at the end of four years, one at the end of six years, and one at the end of eight years, after December 31, 1969; and (2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the terms for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

(b) Each member of the Commission shall be eligible for reappointment.

(c) A vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers.

(d) Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

(e) Each member of the Commission shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for level IV under subsection 5315 of title 5, United States Code except the Chairman who shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for level III under section 5314 of such title.

ATTORNEYS, EXAMINERS, AND EMPLOYEES OF THE COMMISSION; EXPENSES

SEC. 203. (a) The Commission is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers, attorneys, examiners, experts and other employees as may be necessary for carrying out its functions under this Act.

(b) All expenses of the Commission, including all necessary traveling and subsistence expenses of the Commission incurred by the members or employees of the Commission under its orders, shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Commission or by any individual it designates for that purpose.

PRINCIPAL OFFICE

SEC. 204. The principal office of the Commission shall be in the District of Columbia, but the Commission or any duly authorized representative may exercise any or all of its powers in any place.

POWERS AND PROCEDURES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 205. (a) Upon request made to the Commission after the filing of an application under the provisions of this Act, the Commission or its duly authorized representative shall have a hearing on such application, shall fix a time and place for such hearing, and shall cause notice thereof to be given to the applicant.

(b) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Commission, or any member thereof, or its duly authorized representative, may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony as the Commission or such member may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths, or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before such member. The Commission shall have such powers of subpena and compulsion of attendance and production of documents as are conferred upon the Securities and Exchange Commission by subsection (c) of section 18 of the Act of August 26, 1935, and the provisions of subsection (d) of such section shall be applicable to all persons summoned by subpena or otherwise to attend or testify or produce such documents as are described therein before the Commission, except that no subpena shall be issued except under the signature of the Chairman, and application to any court for aid in enforcing such subpena may be made only by said Chairman. Subpenas shall be served by any person designated by the said Chairman.

(c) In any case in which the person entitled to make an application is a child, the application may be made on his behalf by any person acting as his parent or guardian. In any case in which the person entitled to make an application is mentally defective, the application may be made on his behalf by his guardian or such other individual authorized to administer his estate.

(d) Where any application is made to the Commission under this Act, the applicant, and any attorney assisting the Commission, shall be entitled to appear and be heard.

(e) Any other person may appear and be heard who satisfies the Commission that he has a substantial interest in the proceedings.

(f) Where under this Act any person is entitled to appear and be heard by the Commission, that person may appear in person or by his attorney.

(g) Every person appearing under the preceding subsections of this section shall have the right to produce evidence and to cross-examine witnesses.

(h) The Commission or its duly authorized representative may receive in evidence any statement, document, information, or matter that may in the opinion of the Commission contribute to its functions under this Act, whether or not such statement, document, information, or matter would be admissible in a court of law, except that any evidence introduced by or on behalf of the person or persons charged with causing the injury or death of the victim, any request for a stay of the Commission's action, and the fact of any award granted by the Commission shall not be admissible against such person or persons in any prosecution for such injury or death.

(i) If any person has been convicted of any offense with respect to an act or omission on which a claim under this Act is based, proof of that conviction shall, unless an appeal against the conviction or a petition for a rehearing or certiorari in respect of the charge is pending or a new trial or rehearing has been ordered, be taken as conclusive evidence that the offense has been committed.

(j) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the provisions of subchapter II of chapter 5 and chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code shall apply to the proceedings of the Commission.

ATTORNEYS' FEES

SEC. 206. (a) The Commission shall publish regulations providing that an attorney shall, at the conclusion of proceedings under this Act, file with the agency a statement of the amount of fee charged in connection with his services rendered in such proceedings.

(b) After the fee information is filed by an attorney under (a) above, the Commission may determine, in accordance with such published rules or regulations as it may provide, that such fee charged is excessive. If, after notice to the attorney of this determination, the Commission and the attorney fail to agree upon a fee, the Commission, may within ninety days after the receipt of the information required by (a) above, petition the United States district court in the district in which the attorney maintains an office, and the court shall determine a reasonable fee for the services rendered by the attorney.

(c) Any attorney who charges, demands, receives, or collects for services rendered in connection with any proceedings under this Act any amount in excess of that allowed under this section if any compensation is paid, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

FINALITY OF DECISION

SEC. 207. The orders and decisions of the Commission shall be reviewable on appeal, except that no trial de novo of the facts determined by the Commission shall be allowed.

REGULATIONS

SEC. 208. In the performance of its functions, the Commission is authorized to make, promulgate, issue, rescind, and amend rules and regulations prescribing the procedures to be followed in the filing of applications and the proceedings under this Act, and such other matters as the Commission deems appropriate.

TITLE III—AWARD AND PAYMENT OF COMPENSATION

AWARDING COMPENSATION

SEC. 301. (a) In any case in which a person is injured or killed by any act or omission of any other person which is within the description of the offenses listed in section 302 of this Act, the Commission may, in its discretion, upon an application, order the payment of compensation in accordance with the provisions of this Act, if such act or omission occurs within the District of Columbia.

(b) The Commission may order the payment of compensation—

(1) to or on behalf of the injured person; or

(2) in the case of the personal injury of the victim, where the compensation is for pecuniary loss suffered or expenses incurred by any person responsible for the maintenance of the victim, to that person; or

(3) in the case of the death of the victim, to or for the benefit of the dependents or closest relative of the deceased victim, or any one or more of such dependents.

(c) For the purposes of this Act, a person shall be deemed to have intended an act or omission notwithstanding that by reason of age, insanity, drunkenness, or otherwise he was legally incapable of forming a criminal intent.

(d) In determining whether to make an order under this section, or the amount of any award, the Commission may consider any circumstances it determines to be relevant, including the behavior of the victim which directly or indirectly contributed to his injury or death, unless such injury or death resulted from the victim's lawful attempt to prevent the commission of a crime or to apprehend an offender.

(e) No order may be made under this section unless the Commission, supported by substantial evidence, finds that—

(1) such an act or omission did occur; and

(2) the injury or death resulted from such act or omission.

(f) An order may be made under this section whether or not any person is prosecuted or convicted of any offense arising out of such act or omission, or if such act or omission is the subject of any other legal action. Upon application from the Attorney General or the person or persons alleged to have caused the injury or death, the Commission shall suspend proceedings under this Act until such application is withdrawn or until a prosecution for an offense arising out of such act or omission is no longer pending or imminent. The Commission may suspend proceedings in the interest of justice if a civil action arising from such act or omission is pending or imminent.

(g) Upon certification by the Commission, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia shall pay to the person named in such order the amount specified therein.

OFFENSES TO WHICH THIS ACT APPLIES

SEC. 302. The Commission may order the payment of compensation in accordance with the provisions of this Act for personal injury or death which resulted from the following offenses:

(1) Arson (D.C. Code, sec. 22-401);

(2) Assault (D.C. Code, secs. 22-503, 504);

(3) Assault with intent to kill, rob, or rape, and attempt to poison (D.C. Code, sec. 22-501);

(4) Assault with intent to commit mayhem or with dangerous weapon (D.C. Code, sec. 22-502);

(5) Indecent act with children (D.C. Code, sec. 22-3501);

(6) Kidnaping (D.C. Code, sec. 22-2101);

(7) Lewd, indecent or obscene acts (D.C. Code, sec. 22-1112);

(8) Manslaughter (D.C. Code, sec. 22-2405);

(9) Murder (D.C. Code, secs. 22-2401, 2402, 2403);

(10) Negligent homicide (D.C. Code, sec. 40-606);

(11) Rape (D.C. Code, sec. 22-2801);

(12) Robbery (D.C. Code, sec. 22-2901);

(13) Unauthorized use of vehicles (D.C. Code, sec. 22-2204);

(14) or other crimes involving force to the person.

NATURE OF THE COMPENSATION

SEC. 303. The Commission may order the payment of compensation under this Act for—

(a) expenses actually and reasonably incurred as a result of the personal injury or death of the victim;

(b) loss of earning power as a result of total or partial incapacity of such victim;

(c) pecuniary loss to the dependents of the deceased victim;

(d) pain and suffering of the victim; and

(e) any other pecuniary loss resulting from the personal injury or death of the victim which the Commission determines to be reasonable.

LIMITATIONS UPON AWARDING COMPENSATION

SEC. 304. (a) No order for the payment of compensation shall be made under section 301 of this Act unless the application has been made within two years after the date of the personal injury or death.

(b) No compensation shall be awarded under this Act to or on behalf of any victim in an amount in excess of $25,000.

(c) No compensation shall be awarded if the victim was at the time of the personal injury or death of the victim living with the offender as his wife or her husband or in situations when the Commission at its discretion feels unjust enrichment to or on behalf of the offender would result.

TERMS OF THE ORDER

SEC. 305. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section any order for the payment of compensation under this Act may be made on such terms as the Commission deems appropriate.

(b) The Commission shall deduct from any payments awarded under section 301 of this Act any payments received by the victim or by any of his dependents from the offender or from any person on behalf of the offender, or from the United States (except those received under this Act), a State or any of its subdivisions, for personal injury or death compensable under this Act, but only to the extent that the sum of such payments and any award under this Act are in excess of the total compensable injuries suffered by the victim as determined by the Commission.

(c) The Commission may at any time, on its own motion or on the application of the Attorney General, or of the victim or his dependents, or of the offender, vary any order for the payment of compensation made under this Act in such manner as the Commission thinks fit, whether as to terms of the order or by increasing or decreasing the amount of the award or otherwise.

TITLE IV—RECOVERY OF COMPENSATION

RECOVERY FROM OFFENDER

SEC. 401. (a) Whenever any person is convicted of an offense and an order for the payment of compensation is or has been made under this Act for a personal injury or death resulting from the act or omission constituting such offense, the Commission may institute an action against such person for the recovery of the whole or any specified part of such compensation in the district court of the United States for any judicial district in which such person resides or is found. Such court shall have jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render judgment in any such action.

(b) Process of the district court for any judicial district in any action under this section may be served in any other judicial district of the United States by the United States marshal thereof. Whenever it appears to the court in which any action under this section is pending that other parties should be brought before the court in such action, the court may cause such other parties to be summoned from any judicial district of the United States.

(c) An order for the payment of compensation under this Act shall not affect the right of any person to recover damages from any other person by a civil action for the injury or death.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS

SEC. 501. The Commission shall transmit to the President and to the Congress annually a report of its activities under this Act including the name of each applicant, a brief description of the facts in each case, and the amount, if any, of compensation awarded.

PENALTIES

SEC. 502. The provisions of section 1001 of title 18 of the United States Code shall apply to any application, statement, document, or information presented to the Commission under this Act.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 503. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 504. This Act shall take effect on January 1, 1970.

S. 2939—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO BE KNOWN AS THE INTERCITY RAIL PASSENGER SERVICE ACT OF 1969

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I introduce legislation today which will provide railroads with modern, attractive passenger equipment. If this measure is passed, I believe it will begin the renaissance of our passenger railroad industry. At present rail passenger service is a neglected and dying component of our transportation network. If we are to have a balanced, rational, and efficient transportation system, this vital part—intercity railroad passenger service—must be revived and preserved.

Intercity rail service offers unique transportation characteristics that make it the most efficient way to move large numbers of people between cities for distances of under 300 miles.

First. Door-to-door travel time is lower because railroad stations are in the center of our large cities.

Second. Railway travel is usually safer and more comfortable than air or road.

Third. There is little of the harmful air and noise pollution that comes from cars or planes.

Fourth. The cost of the land needed for railroads is miniscule compared to highway right-of-way costs or the expensive sites for airfields near cities. After all, one track of rail can move the same number of passengers per hour as 24 lanes of superhighway.

Not only is railway passenger service the best way to move people between cities in high density areas, but also it is needed to relieve the strangulation of our other modes of transport. I need not elaborate upon the massive overloading, the long delays, and the resulting unreliability of road and jet travel in our Nation. Trains can move 50,000 persons an hour over a single track without a delay. Can we utterly ignore this transportation capability today, as cars are stalled on our roads and our planes stacked up above our airports?

As this country needs passenger rail service more and more, we are getting less and less. From 1946 to 1969 the number of passenger trains in the United States has decreased from 11,000 to less than 500. In the past decade, the number of passengers using railroads has decreased 40 percent. Thirty-six percent of the 1958 passenger routes no longer exist today. Almost every week we hear the announcement of another passenger train discontinuance. It is clear that if we do not move swiftly, we will have nothing left to preserve or rebuild.

Why are our passenger trains disappearing? Because the railroads, attracted by the high profits from their freight business, have ignored and neglected railway passenger service. Without the railroads' attention, capital, advertising, or even slight regard for customers, passengers have naturally left the trains, lured to the ubiquitous car or the highly advertised jet. After driving revenue away deliberately, the railroads then seek to discontinue the passenger routes which they have made unprofitable.

So we must act—and act swiftly—to halt this spiral of poor service and poor profits and to save this vital part of our transport network.

My bill will break this interaction between dispirited passengers and uninterested railroads by authorizing the Seretary of Transportation to buy new cars and lease them to the railroads or to buy old cars, rehabilitate them, and lease them back. The legislation will allow the Department of Transportation to replace or repair all the passenger cars that will need major overhaul in the next 4 years. The leasing revenues must pay for the full cost of servicing, maintaining, and repairing these cars. The Department of Transportation will choose which passenger routes are most vital to our transportation network and aid those lines.

This help is not an operating subsidy which would throw good money into

bad service and a dying industry. Rather this legislation enables the Department of Transportation to choose those passenger routes that must be saved and prescribe service standards. Under last week's decision of the ICC, service standards will not be forthcoming from the Commission. Here is a simple and fair method to upgrade passenger service. For once, there will be planning and policy instead of random decay.

The combination of new equipment and good service will turn the railroad passenger business towards a solid financial basis. Further, by offering to lease this new equipment, the Secretary of Transportation will be granting enough hope of profitability to preclude a railroad from discontinuing an essential passenger route. The railroads, knowing that they are in the passenger business to stay, will finally devote the energies, skills, and capital to this desperately needed service.

Of course, reviving passenger service will take some money. Every transportation system we have costs money. This bill provides for the expenditure of $190 million over 4 years, the sum needed to maintain and improve railway passenger cars and to begin to revive passenger service. Compared to the resources devoted to other less efficient and highly overcrowded modes of travel, this is very little money. The President has asked for $5 billion to spend on airports. By 1972, $56 billion will have been spent upon the Interstate System. But in many areas of the country, the roads and airways are incapable of handling intercity traffic. Do we continue to pour more money into the same programs, or shall we move to a policy of balance and efficiency?

Mr. President, I believe I have given as much effort as any Senator to cutting waste in our budget and in delaying unessential expenditures until after the Vietnam war ends. But I feel certain that if we wait too long to revive our rail passenger service, there will be nothing left but history. We must act now in order to save money later when the cost of reviving a dead rail passenger service will be prohibitive. We must act to achieve a balanced transportation policy. We must act now or this Nation shall pay for decades with distorted, inadequate and inefficient transportation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the end of my remarks the text of my bill be printed, along with a companion fact sheet. I would like to thank the National Association of Railroad Passengers for assistance with some technical matters related to this problem.

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

The bill (S. 2939) to provide for the modernization of railroad passenger equipment in order to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows;

S. 2939

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 "Intercity Rail Passenger Service Act of 1969".

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec.
101. Congressional findings and declaration of purpose.
102. Definitions.
103. Act controlling.
104. Separability.

§ 101. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE.

The Congress finds that modern, efficient intercity railroad passenger service is a necessary part of a balanced transportation system; that the public convenience and necessity requires the continuance and improvement of such service to provide low cost transportation between crowded urban areas and in increasingly isolated rural areas; that rail passenger service can help to end the congestion on our highways and the overcrowding of our airlanes and airports; that the traveller in America should have freedom to choose that mode of travel most convenient to his needs; that to achieve these goals requires the restructuring and reequipment of existing passenger service; that the railroads have an obligation to provide good passenger service to the public; that the railroad industry cannot accomplish this task relying on its own financial resources alone; that Federal assistance is required to assist the railroads in meeting their public utility obligation; and therefore, it is the purpose of this Act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to purchase, rehabilitate, lease, service, maintain, and repair intercity railroad passenger equipment.

§ 102. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of the Act—

(a) "Fund" means the Railroad Passenger Equipment Operating Fund established by section 301 of this Act.

(b) "Railroad" means a common carrier by railroad, as defined in section 1 of part 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1).

(c) "Railroad passenger equipment" means locomotives, cars, and other vehicles used or to be used for or in conjunction with the intercity transportation of passengers by railroad.

(d) "Rehabilitation" and "rehabilitate" mean a substantial rebuilding or alteration of railroad passenger equipment so as to significantly improve its operating efficiency and its attractiveness to passengers, and also includes extensive repairs made necessary on account of the equipment having been permitted to substantially deteriorate.

(e) "Repair" and "repairs" mean such periodic repair work on railroad passenger equipment as must be performed in a repair shop, but which does not involve substantial rebuilding or alteration of the equipment, nor its rehabilitation after a period during which it has been permitted to substantially deteriorate.

(f) "Secretary" means Secretary of Transportation or his delegate.

(g) "Service and maintain" and "servicing and maintenance" mean the day to day upkeep of railroad passenger equipment, including the performance of minor running repairs of a nature that can be performed in a terminal facility without the necessity of taking the equipment to a repair shop.

(h) "Total operating expense" means and includes all expenses of the Secretary incurred in the administration of his functions under this Act and in the servicing, maintenance, and repair of railroad passenger equipment, but does not include the cost of purchase or rehabilitation of railroad passenger equipment, nor the cost of purchase of plant facilities, tools, equipment, and other instrumentalities for the rehabilitation and repair of railroad passenger equipment.

§ 103. ACT CONTROLLING.

Insofar as the provisions of any other law are inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, the provisions of this Act shall be controlling.

§ 104. SEPARABILITY.

Notwithstanding any other evidences of the intention of Congress, it is hereby declared to be the controlling intent of Congress that if any provisions of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, shall be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of the Act or its applications to other persons or circumstances, but shall be confined in its operation to the provisions of this Act or the application thereof to the persons or circumstances directly involved in the controversy in which the judgment shall have been rendered.

TITLE II—PURCHASE, REHABILITATION, LEASE, SERVICING, MAINTENANCE, AND REPAIR OF RAILROAD PASSENGER EQUIPMENT AND PLANT FACILITIES

Sec.
201. Purchase and rehabilitation of existing railroad passenger equipment
202. Purchase of new railroad passenger equipment
203. Lease of railroad passenger equipment
204. Servicing, maintenance, and repair of railroad passenger equipment
205. Provision of modern plant facilities, tools, equipment, and other instrumentalities for the rehabilitation and repair of railroad passenger equipment
206. Appointment of personnel; procurement of services
207. Protective arrangements for employees; labor standards

§ 201. PURCHASE AND REHABILITATION OF EXISTING RAILROAD PASSENGER EQUIPMENT.

(a) The Secondary is authorized to purchase existing railroad passenger equipment which, in his judgment, is capable of providing efficient, dependable, and attractive railroad passenger service or which, in his judgment, could be economically rehabilitated to provide such service.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to contract for such rehabilitation with persons or corporations as in his judgment are capable of performing the work in an efficient and economical manner.

§ 202. PURCHASE OF NEW RAILROAD PASSENGER EQUIPMENT.

The Secretary is authorized to purchase new railroad passenger equipment of such type and design as, in his judgment, would enable the provision of efficient, dependable, and attractive railroad passenger service.

§ 203. LEASE OF RAILROAD PASSENGER EQUIPMENT.

(a) The Secretary is authorized to lease railroad passenger equipment to any railroad or railroads, or to any regional transportation authority established.

(b) Leases shall be either for individual equipment trips or for a fixed term. Rental for trip leases shall be computed on the basis of actual miles operated in revenue service or on such other basis as the Secretary may determine.

(c) The Secretary shall set lease levels at such a level that the total operating expense, as heretofore defined, is met by such rentals.

(d) During the term of leases, lessees shall adequately service and maintain the equipment except to the extent this work is to be performed by the Secretary as specifically provided for in the lease. Lessees shall comply with all governmental laws, regulations, and requirements, and with such rules and regulations as the Secretary may establish with respect to the maintenance, use and operation of railroad equipment, including passenger service standards.

(e) Railroad lessees shall have the right to arrange for movement of leased equipment over the lines of other railroads, either within the continental United States or beyond the limits thereof, in accordance with normal arrangements for the interchange of such equipment between them.

§ 204. SERVICING, MAINTENANCE, AND REPAIR OF RAILROAD PASSENGER EQUIPMENT.

(a) The Secretary is authorized to service, maintain, and repair railroad passenger equipment acquired under the provisions of sections 201 and 202 above, except to the extent that lessees are obligated to perform such functions in accordance with the provisions of section 203(d) above. In exercising this authority, the Secretary may contract for such servicing, maintenance, and repair with persons or corporations as in his judgment are capable of performing such functions in an efficient and economical manner, and may acquire, by purchase or lease, and operate servicing and maintenance facilities at such locations as he deems expedient.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to service and maintain railroad passenger equipment owned by any railroad or railroads at facilities operated by the Secretary under subsection (a) above. Remuneration to the Secretary shall be at least equal to the incremental cost of performing such work.

§ 205. PROVISION OF MODERN PLANT FACILITIES, TOOLS, EQUIPMENT, AND OTHER INSTRUMENTALITIES FOR THE REHABILITATION AND REPAIR OF RAILROAD PASSENGER EQUIPMENT.

The Secretary is authorized to purchase plant facilities; tools, equipment, and other instrumentalities for the rehabilitation and repair of railroad passenger equipment, and to lease these items to persons or corporations whom he has contracted with to rehabilitate and repair railroad passenger equipment under the provisions of sections 201(b) and 204(a) above. The Secretary shall fix rentals for such leases which shall be at least equal to the cost of the item amortized over its normal service life.

§ 206. APPOINTMENT OF PERSONNEL; PROCUREMENT OF SERVICES.

The Secretary is authorized to appoint, subject to the provisions of title 5 of the United States Code governing appointment in the competitive service, such personnel as may be necessary to enable him to carry out efficiently his functions and responsibilities under this Act. The Secretary is further authorized to procure services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5 of the United States Code, but at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem, unless otherwise specified in an appropriation Act.

§ 207. PROTECTIVE ARRANGEMENTS FOR EMPLOYEES, LABOR STANDARDS.

(a) In carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary shall provide fair and equitable arrangements, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, to protect the interests of employees who are affected by any action of the Secretary authorized by this Act. Such protective arrangements shall include, without being limited to, such provisions as may be necessary for (1) the preservation of rights, privileges, and benefits (including continuation of pension rights and benefits) to such employees under existing collective bargaining agreements or otherwise; (2) the continuation of collective bargaining rights; (3) the protection of such individual employees against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment; (4) assurances of priority of reemployment of employees terminated or laid off; and (5) paid training or retraining programs. Such arrangements shall include provisions protecting individual employees against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment which shall in no event provide benefits less than those established pursuant to section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act. Any contract entered into pursuant to the provisions of sections 201, 202, 204 or 205 of this Act shall specify the terms and conditions of such protective arrangements.

(b) The Secretary shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors in the performance of construction work financed with the assistance of funds received under any contract or agreement entered into under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended. The Secretary shall not enter into any such contract or agreement without first obtaining adequate assurance that required labor standards will be maintained on the construction work. The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this paragraph, the authority and functions set forth in the Reorganization Plan numbered 14 of 1950, and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934 (40 U.S.C. 276 (c)).

TITLE III—AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS

Sec.
301. Establishment of operating fund
302. Use of fund
303. Authorization of appropriations to fund

§ 301. ESTABLISHMENT OF OPERATING FUND.

The Railroad Passenger Equipment Operating Fund (hereinafter referred to as the "Fund") is established in the Treasury of the United States as a separate fund subject to withdrawal by check by the Secretary of Transportation. There shall be deposited in the Fund the following items:

(a) Payments received by the Secretary for the lease of railroad passenger equipment pursuant to section 203 of this Act;

(b) Payments received by the Secretary for the servicing and maintenance of railroad passenger equipment pursuant to section 204 (b) of this Act;

(c) Payments received by the Secretary for the lease of plant facilities and other items pursuant to section 205 of this Act;

(d) Payments received by the Secretary for the sale or other disposition of railroad passenger equipment, facilities, and other items, which in his judgment are no longer needed to carry out his functions under this Act, such sale or disposition to be made in accordance with applicable law governing disposal of surplus government property; and

(c) Funds appropriated to the Secretary as authorized by section 303 of this Act.

§ 302. USE OF FUND.

(a) The Secretary shall use the moneys in the Fund to pay all the expenses and costs of the administration and operation of his functions under this Act, including, but not limited to—

(1) purchase and rehabilitation of existing railroad passenger equipment

(2) purchase of new railroad passenger equipment under section 202 of this Act;

(3) servicing, maintenance, and repair of railroad passenger equipment under section 204(a) of the Act;

(4) purchase of plant facilities and other items under section 205 of this Act;

(5) purchase or lease of necessary office and warehouse facilities, materials, and supplies; and

(6) salaries, wages, and related retirement and other employee benefit contribution.

(b) Moneys deposited in the Fund shall remain available for expenditure without limitation as to time and are not subject to apportionment under section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 665).

(c) From time to time the Secretary shall deposit in the general fund of the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts those balances in the Fund which he determines to be in excess of the amount required for the administration and operation of his functions under this Act.

§ 303. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS TO FUND.

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Fund such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act; but not to exceed $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; and $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec.
401. Laws applicable
402. Audit of contracts
403. Annual report to Congress
404. Information furnished to Congressional committees

§ 401. LAWS APPLICABLE.

(a) Leases and contracts entered into by the Secretary, regardless of the place where the same may be executed, shall be governed by the laws of the District of Columbia.

(b) Railroad passenger equipment, while the same is under lease, shall be and remain subject to applicable provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act and other governing statutes and to the exercise of jurisdiction by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Railroad Administration pursuant thereto, and the Secretary shall comply with the provisions of section 20c of the Interstate Commerce Act by filing with the said Commission a copy of all leases entered into under the provisions of this Act: *Provided, however,* That neither the Secretary nor any of his functions pursuant to this Act, other than as above specifically set forth, shall be subject to the Interstate Commerce Act or to the exercise of any jurisdiction by the said Commission.

§ 402. AUDIT OF CONTRACTS.

Each agreement or contract entered into under this Act other than under competitive bidding procedures, as determined by the Secretary, shall provide that the Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, may, for the purpose of audit, and examination, have access to any books, documents, papers, and records of the parties to such agreement or contract which are pertinent to the operations or activities under such agreement or contract.

§ 403. ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.

The Secretary shall submit to Congress on the first day of each regular session an annual report setting forth a statement of his activities, receipts, and expenditures pursuant to this Act during the previous fiscal year.

§ 404. INFORMATION FURNISHED TO CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.

The Secretary shall, if requested by any appropriate committee of the Senate or House of Representatives, furnish such committee with information concerning activities carried out under this Act.

The fact sheet, presented by Mr. TYDINGS, is as follows:

INTERCITY RAIL PASSENGER SERVICE BILL
FACT SHEET

There is an essential need for rail passenger service between the large cities of the urbanized sections of the country. The advantages of rail transportation for shorter distances include the ability to compete with air transportation on a door-to-door travel time, greater passenger comfort, convenience, and safety, and more efficient land use and less noise and air pollution. Moreover, a revitalized rail transportation system would allow a more rational use to be made of our highways and our limited airport capacity.

THE THEORY BEHIND THE BILL

The railroads are now reluctant to make a capital investment in new equipment for a service which would at best break even at present service standards. The bill will help to bring the passengers back to the trains and will reduce operating expenses by cutting repair and maintenance costs. An operating subsidy would only pay for existing inefficiencies and give the railroads no incentive to reduce costs or to increase revenues on their own initiative. It would merely switch the burden of paying for a losing service to the taxpayers from the railroads and perpetuate the existing deterioration.

THE BILL

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to use the funds appropriated by Congress to

1. purchase new rail passenger equipment, (§ 202);

2. purchase existing rolling stock of the railroads and contract for its rehabilitation (§ 201), and

3. lease this equipment back to the railroads or to any regional transportation authority on a trip or term basis [§ 203 (a), (b)].

The revenue received by DOT from leasing the equipment must be sufficient to cover the cost to DOT of servicing, maintaining, and repairing the equipment, i.e., the total operating expenses [§ 203(c)]. The cars would be repaired, serviced and maintained

1. by contract, in modern, centralized shops built with the funds appropriated [§ 204(a) and § 205].

2. by contract in private facilities [§204 (a)], or

3. by the lessee himself, according to the terms of the lease [§203(d)].

In addition, the Secretary is authorized to service and maintain rail passenger equipment not purchased from the railroads, but he must be reimbursed by the railroad for the cost of performing such work [§ 204(b)].

COST

The cost of an attractive, revitalized railroad passenger system is insignificant compared to the $56 *billion* that will have been spent on the Interstate Highway System by 1972 and the $5 billion called for by the President to be spent by the federal government over the next ten years for the improvement of airports and airway systems. This bill authorizes $195 million to be appropriated over a four year period ($15 million for FY '70, $60 million for each of FY '71, '72, '73).

For too long we have approved vast expenditures for highways, airways, and airports, only to find today that they are incapable of handling the intercity passenger traffic imposed on them. Railway passenger systems have the potential of moving a large volume of people over long distances at low cost. The mass transit bills, trust fund, or otherwise, concern *intra*-city, not *inter*-city transportation.

HOW THE BILL WOULD OPERATE

The bill will require coordination between DOT and the ICC. DOT will be able to restructure intercity passenger service by leasing cars to railroads for operation only over desired routes planned as part of a national transportation policy. DOT and the ICC will have to cooperate in deciding what routes are necessary and what routes the ICC should allow the railroads to discontinue.

Most importantly, DOT could prescribe service standards to the passenger railroads as a condition for leasing the new equipment. This would force some of the railroads to upgrade their services instead of downgrading them. Attractive equipment will help bring some of the passengers back to the trains, but this will have to be accompanied by better service from the railroads if the railway passenger system is to be viable. The penalty for not providing adequate service will be cancellation of the lease. The railroad will then be faced with operating its older and most costly passenger equipment over the same route, since the ICC would not have given it authority to discontinue the train. This refusal by the ICC could operate indefinitely; it would be impossible for the railroads to prove that the fault for ensuing losses was not their own. The ICC will maintain, of course, that had the railroads provided adequate service by DOT standards with the more attractive equipment, they would have been running a more successful train. Moreover, as better service and attractive equipment combine to make passenger trains financially successful, the railroads and DOT could plan together to restore many of the old routes previously discontinued.

To preserve the present system may not be enough. Since the bill does not specify the type of equipment to be purchased by DOT, more advanced equipment as turbotrains could be purchased and leased. Also, conventional diesel trains are capable of the increased speeds which would be necessary for tomorrow's high speed corridors.

THE BILL'S URGENCY

The attractiveness of this bill to the passenger railroads depends on ICC determination to refuse discontinuance of DOT designated trains. The few passenger trains left in existence today are being discontinued quickly; therefore, this legislation must be passed immediately if there are to be any routes on which to operate new equipment. The restoration of trains presently discontinued depends upon the success of the new trains operating over the few routes left. This bill does not concern itself with fixed facilities such as track and stations, but it is certain that the railroads will improve these once service equipment is improved and the prospect of profit appears.

INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION—SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 153—TO ESTABLISH A COMMISSION TO REPORT ON AMERICAN TRADE AND TARIFF POLICY

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution to establish a commission to report on American trade and tariff practices and policies. I know of no single area of our national economic life where there is a greater need for an all-inclusive study to determine all of the facts which flow from present tariff practices and policies, both those of the United States and of our trading partners.

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and the agreements which were negotiated thereunder were designed to establish an American trade program and posture which would be in the best interests of the United States, both at home and abroad. Unfortunately, since 1962, there has been constant controversy on both sides of these issues from those seeking greater liberalization of trade and from those who would raise our tariff barriers.

In this Congress and in the last, a great number of bills have been introduced which in one form or another would reduce the flow of imported goods available to the American consumer. At the same time that some interests are seeking to restrict imports, others tell us that industry and government alike can do a great deal more by way of expanding U.S. exports abroad. The arguments on both sides are frequently persuasive, but all too often we are asked to take a position in the field of trade and tariffs in the almost complete absence of hard facts as to what has resulted from our present programs, what will result if we increase or decrease tariff barriers, and what may result from a really intensive export expansion program.

The Commission I am proposing will call upon some of this country's best qualified leaders, both in and out of government, who will first develop and report the facts, and, second, will advocate future courses of action, both legislative, if necessary, and new government and private initiatives. Such a study and report should then enable the Congress to make a sound decision on the various legislative approaches which have been proposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 153) to establish a Commission to report upon the condition and future of American policy respecting all aspects of international trade and tariffs, introduced by Mr. MATHIAS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION

S. 2523

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) and the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY), be added as cosponsors of S. 2523, to extend, amend, and improve certain public health laws relating to mental health.

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

S. 2658

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS) be added as a cosponsor of S. 2658, to provide pensions for veterans of World War I.

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

S. 2890

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN), I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing,

the names of the Senators from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS and Mr. GRAVEL), the Senators from Utah (Mr. MOSS and Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senators from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON and Mr. DOLE), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) be added as cosponsors of S. 2890, to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit certain active duty for training to be counted as active duty for purposes of entitlement to educational benefits under chapter 34 of such title.

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

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN) be added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 1, proposing an amendment to the Constitution, providing for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States.

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

SENATE RESOLUTION 261—RESOLUTION TO PRINT A LIST OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 261), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 261

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document a list of proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America submitted during the Eighty-eighth Congress, first session, through the Ninetieth Congress, second session, as compiled by the Senate Library, under the direction of the Secretary of the Senate, and that one thousand five hundred additional copies be printed for the use of the Secretary of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, September 19, 1969, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 728) for the relief of Capt. Richard L. Shumaker, U.S. Army.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1969—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 176

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, today I am submitting an amendment to the foreign aid bill (S. 2347) to authorize over a 5-year period the expenditure of $5 million to provide financial support for the expansion and improvement of American-sponsored medical facilities in Israel. I am pleased to say that the senior Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) and the senior Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) have joined with me as cosponsors in presenting this amendment.

The medical facilities which are the subject of this amendment are under the sponsorship of the Hadassah Medical Relief Association, Inc., a private, nonprofit agency registered with the President's Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid.

Though Hadassah's operations are supported exclusively from grants and contributions, it nevertheless manages to support effectively a wide range of activities in both the United States and Israel. For the most part, all of its programs are geared to assisting the deprived or underprivileged, with primary attention focused on meeting the training and educational needs of these members of society.

With respect to its medical training and research programs in Israel, Hadassah is now seeking to implement a 5-year expansion plan, which has a total projected cost of $19 million. Of this total, roughly one-third, or $6.5 million, will be required as the foreign exchange complement. The remaining amount will be consumed by local currency expenditures.

The amendment which I am submitting today is designed to provide a $5 million grant to be expended through fiscal year 1974, thus helping to meet the major portion of the foreign exchange burden as required by Hadassah's planned expansion. The plan itself encompasses three projects:

First. The establishment of an institute of oncology as a part of the Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center complex;

Second. The expansion of certain parts of the medical center's existing facilities; and

Third. The renovation of Hadassah's Mount Scopus Hospital facility.

Each project, in turn, has its own plant and equipment requirements, ranging from elevators to generators to the latest in X-ray equipment. Most of these items will have to be purchased abroad and, of course, the purchase of these items will constitute the hard currency requirement of the entire program. However, Hadassah's plan stipulates that virtually all of its purchases abroad will be made in the United States, thus allaying any fears that the $5 million grant request might adversely affect our balance of payments.

Mr. President, as we are all well aware, the foreign aid program for the past 2 years has received some very serious setbacks, not only financially, but conceptually, and psychologically as well. While there are a variety of reasons for this—many of them all too painfully valid—I should hope that we in the Senate would make every effort to judge each foreign aid project on its merits and in the context of existing political realities.

Given the highly charged political realities of the Middle East, I believe that we cannot be too careful in scrutinizing those projects destined for the countries of that region. Here I think it is important to point out that Hadassah medical facilities in Israel serve Jew and Arab alike, and in fact the renovation of Hadassah's Mount Scopus Hospital will largely be of service to meet the needs of Arab patients. This and similar points concerning Hadassah's record of medical assistance were underscored in a New York Times article which appeared earlier this year, and I ask unanimous consent that this article be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I would certainly hope that all of my colleagues would take a few minutes to read this article, for it is a hopeful reminder that human understanding and interest in the welfare of one's fellow man are not to be shunted aside in the face of great conflict and turmoil.

This, indeed, is the message of Hadassah's medical services in Israel; and it is the kind of message which our foreign aid program is meant to sustain. Accordingly, I hope that my colleagues will give their full consideration to the amendment which I am submitting today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 176) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXHIBIT 1

ARABS STILL CROSSING FRONTIER TO GET HADASSAH MEDICAL AID: EVEN GUERRILLA FIGHTERS ARE TREATED AT ADVANCED JERUSALEM HOSPITAL WHERE 1967 WAR HAS BROUGHT MANY CHANGES

(By James Feron)

JERUSALEM, Jan. 25.—One of the best-kept secrets of the nearly two decades of armed truce between Israel and Jordan that exploded into war in 1967 was the treatment by Israeli doctors of prominent Arab patients.

The Arabs would cross the Mandelbaum Gate transit point in Jerusalem, sometimes after having been transferred in no man's land from an ambulance of the Red Crescent to one of the Red Star of David.

The patients would be treated in almost every instance at the Hebrew University-Hadassah Medical Center, probably the most advanced such institution in the Middle East, and would then return to Jordan just as quietly.

A reminder that this unusual medical traffic still exists across an even more actively hostile frontier came last week when a 42-year-old resident of Irbid in Jordan left Hadassah after open heart surgery.

MANY GET TREATMENT NOW

The patient, Fuad Awadi, is a clerk in a taxi office. He required hospitalization while visiting his family in Kafr Kanna a town he fled in 1948 when it came under Israeli control.

Prominent Arab patients still come to Hadassah but the open-border policy instituted by Jordan and Israel across their cease-fire line after the six-day war in June, 1967, means that any of the hundreds of ordinary Arabs who cross each week can get the treatment once open only to the influential.

The Israeli hospital has also treated nearly 50 Arab guerrillas, most of them members of Al Fatah, in the many months of Arab commando activity since the war.

"They're really a nuisance," Dr. Kalmann

Mann, the director of the hospital, said in a recent interview, "They end up in the best rooms because they come in with policemen to guard them and they need the extra space."

Arguments have often ensued between the guerrillas and Israeli patients who do not regard the Arab patients with the equanimity of the hospital staff.

Dr. Mann also described some other ways in which the war and the Israeli occupation of the west-bank area of Jordan has altered the medical center's operations.

"Even before the war was over we began to get Arab patients in here. Some had undergone treatment at our Mount Scopus hospital before 1948 and now they were coming back."

Mount Scopus became an inaccessible and armed Israeli enclave in Jordanian Jerusalem after the 1948 war, so a new structure was built in Israeli Jerusalem. The original hospital will be reopened next year, essentially for Arab patients.

HOSTILITY BECOMES PROBLEM

The mutual hostility that developed since 1948 became something of a problem between Jews and Arabs at Hadassah when the 1967 war ended and they were exposed to each other.

"That first week in June we were taking in Arab soldiers and some of our nurses began to object," Dr. Mann said. "We had a little talk in my office and since then it has been all right."

"I told them that we have to treat them as individuals, not as the enemy, and I told them of my own experience in World War II treating German prisoners in Southampton, England," he added.

As for noncombatants, Dr. Mann said, the hospital handles an average of 35 outpatients from towns in occupied Arab areas each day and an average of 10 bed patients from these areas each month.

SOME SEEK LAST CHANCE

Many Arab patients arriving at Hadassah immediately after the war were seeking cures for long-neglected ailments, such as skin diseases, and were seeking "one last chance" on major illnesses.

Last month Hadassah signed an agreement with the United Nations Relief and Works Agency to treat refugee heart and cancer patients. Every day now ambulances bring the patients from among the approximately half-million refugees under Israeli control.

Most refugee cases are treated by the Augusta Victoria Hospital atop the Mount of Olives, which is run by the Lutheran World Federation. Hadassah and Augusta Victoria medical officials meet weekly to determine which cases are to be treated at Hadassah.

The United Nations agency pays Hadassah just under $2 for each heart patient, which Dr. Mann says is a token, and nothing for the cancer cases. The agency was reported by Hadassah to have said that the Jordanian Government had a similar agreement with the United Nations, although heart cases are sent to Cairo and Beirut for treatment.

Medical costs are far in excess of the fees that Arab patients are able to pay, Dr. Mann said. This would indicate that contributors would have to continue to support the broadened services.

NO URGENT CASE REJECTED

A bed costs about $30 a day, Dr. Mann said, but the hospital tries to get at least $9 from each patient. No urgent case is turned away, however, he added.

Israel's sick fund pays about that amount, but only 10 per cent of the Arabs living in East Jerusalem, which has been absorbed by Israel, are covered by this plan. West-bank and Gaza Strip residents have no such medical coverage.

Indigent cases are worth $2.70 from the Municipality of Jersualem, Dr. Mann said, so Hadassah asks west-bank Arabs who are not working to pay that much, although few do. "One third of our cancer radiation cases are Arabs," the doctor said. "It's quite a problem."

NOTICE OF CHANGE OF HEARING DATE

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations will now hold hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1969, a plan to reorganize the Interstate Commerce Commission, in room 3302 at 9:30 a.m. on Friday, September 26, 1969. The hearing had originally been scheduled for October 2.

EFFECT OF TAX BILL ON PRIVATE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, earlier this week the Washington Friends of Education, an organization representing the presidents and trustees of nine independent accredited colleges in Washington State, submitted a statement to the Committee on Finance on H.R. 13270, the tax reform bill passed by the House. The statement, which was prepared by Mr. Rodney L. Houts, director of development at Whitworth College, sets forth in concise terms the problems posed by certain provisions of the House bill for those institutions dependent on private support for their growth and survival.

Because the potential effect of the House bill on private educational institutions is a matter of widespread concern, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

The Washington Friends of Higher Education represent all but one of the independent accredited colleges in the state of Washington. This organization has been authorized to speak for the colleges by the presidents and trustees of nine institutions of higher learning. These are, as follows. Gonzaga University, Pacific Lutheran University, Fort Wright College of the Holy Names, St. Martin's College, Seattle Pacific College, Seattle University, University of Puget Sound, Walla Walla College, and Whitworth College. The average age of these institutions is more than 88 years. They represent more than 64,000 living graduates—and presently have enrolled approximately 19,000 students. The annual operating budgets of these institutions exceeds $38 million annually.

During their last fiscal year, these institutions received in gifts more than $7.5 million, of which more than $3 million was in the form of appreciated property. During the last five years, these schools have received more than $44 million in gifts, of which some $17 million dollars was in the form of appreciated property.

These institutions have received in the form of trust, annuities, and other types of deferred, irrevocable gifts in excess of $10 million in the last five years. Nearly $7.5 million of these gifts came in the form of appreciated property. In addition, these institutions are now holding deferred gifts subject to life estate, some from $14 million worth of expectancies.

It is evident from the foregoing figures that gifts—both outright and deferred, and particularly those that come in the form of appreciated property—are absolutely essential to the continuation and the growth of the private sector of higher education in the state of Washington. A sector which incidentally provides a substantial number of the graduates placed into the working economy of the state annually. We therefore urge your careful attention to our testimony which has a direct bearing on our ability to help ourselves.

PARTNERS IN A CAUSE

We, the Washington Friends of Higher Education, believe that our institutions are playing a vital role in preparing young men and women for the leadership of the nation. Our graduates are found in many walks of life—in business, the professions, politics, education, and in social service. We feel, therefore, that we are partners with the Government and Governmental leaders in a cause which is directed toward the highest national good.

For this reason we want it clearly understood that we are in favor of tax reform, that we are in sympathy with Congressional leaders who are seeking equitable and just tax legislation. We would be the first to encourage Congress to eliminate those places in our tax law where individuals are able to use the law for their own selfish means in a way not intended by Congress. We therefore support the underlying principles which created House Bill 13270—and much of what is contained in that Bill.

We are, however, desperately concerned about a few items in House Bill 13270 which would seriously affect our ability to encourage increased support of our institutions. We are totally dependent upon such gifts. Some of the things contained in this Bill would have a devastating effect on those gifts.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES BILL 13270

The items contained in House Bill 13270 which gravely concern the colleges and universities of the state of Washington are as follows:

1. The inclusion of gifts of appreciation of property in the limit on tax preferences and the allocation of deductions: We are pleased that the House Bill retains the present law that a deduction is allowed for the full present fair-market value of a gift and that there is no direct capital gain on the appreciation. However, if a gift of appreciated property is included in the limit on tax preferences and the allocation of deductions, the appreciation will be indirectly or partially taxed because the appreciation on the charitable gift reduces the donor's itemized deductions under the allocation of deductions provision, and may be taxed under the limit on tax preference provision. We are pleased that the Nixon administration has recommended that this provision in H.R. 13270 be changed; and we urge you to accept that recommendation. Under the House provision for the allocation of deductions, the donor who contributes the appreciation on property would have to reduce not only his charitable deduction but also his other deductions for taxes, interest, medical expenses, etc. This is an indirect way of taxing the appreciation and would discourage gifts of appreciated property which are so vital to our institutions. By including the appreciation on property contributed to a charity in the limit on tax preferences, large individual gifts of appreciated property would be discouraged. These large individual gifts are also very much needed and have long been encouraged by Congress.

2. Charitable remainder (life income) trusts [bill section 201 (i), p. 135, line 3]: Present law providing for the charitable deduction allowed for the type of charitable remainder currently used should be retained. Present law provides that there is no capital gain on the transfer of appreciated property to fund a charitable remainder or life income trust, nor is there a capital gain if the

property transferred is later sold by the trust and the gain permanently set aside for the charity. These rules should be retained. The very complicated provisions for a charitable remainder annuity trust and a charitable remainder unitrust should not be substituted for the now widely used and understood charitable remainder trust. These latter trust agreements are too complicated to be understood by donors and would greatly hinder our ability to raise these types of funds. These types of gifts are becoming an increasing part of our gift income. Abuses of the investment policies or other handling of these trusts are very rare, and the Internal Revenue Service has ample means available to curb any abuses which might exist. We urge you not to destroy this important part of our gift income.

However, should Congress decide to abolish the existing charitable remainder trust and substitute the annuity trust and unitrust, the laws governing the present remainder trust should not be retroactive to April 22, as provided by House Bill 13270. This is totally unfair to our donors who have established such trusts since April 22, unaware that such a law would be passed—and without prior warning. Such irrevocable gifts are presently in effect in our institutions.

In addition, whether the present remainder trust remains in effect, or whether the new unitrust or annuity trust is established, the property should be based on the fair market charitable deduction for gifts of appreciated value of the trust at the time of its creation. The donor should not be required to base his deduction upon his cost basis or pay a capital gain if he elects to compute his deduction based on the fair market value.

Furthermore, capital gains incurred by the trust—and permanently aside for the charity—should not be taxed. We do not believe that a donor should be taxed on money which he can never, and will never, receive since it is laid aside for the permanent use of charity.

Finally, the House bill allows no estate tax charitable deduction for a charitable remainder trust unless it is a unitrust or annuity trust. It is our understanding that this law would apply to charitable remainder trusts created before the bill's enactment. Therefore, one of our donors who may have created such an irrevocable trust many years ago, but who dies after the bill's enactment, would lose his state tax charitable deduction unless that charitable remainder trust were a unitrust or an annuity trust. This provision in the House bill is unusually harsh and unfair. We can only assume that it must be an oversight. This retroactive change would require that substantial estate taxes would have to be paid, which would come usually not out of the trusts' principal but from other assets of the estate thereby reducing or in some cases even eliminating bequests to the donor's wife, children, and other family members. We urge you not to apply an estate tax to the trust principal of a charitable remainder trust. However, if such a provision is to be passed, it should not apply to charitable remainder trust and life income contracts made prior to the passage of the bill.

3. Life income contracts: We urge that present law governing life income contracts be retained. Presently there is no capital gain on the transfers of appreciated property for a life income contract, nor is there capital gain when the property transferred is later sold by the life income pooled fund. As is the case with the charitable remainder trust, we believe that the deduction should be based on the full fair-market value without capital gains tax—and that no further capital gains tax should be incurred by the life income pooled fund, which is permanently set aside for charity.

However, if this important form of gift income should be denied us, such laws should not be retroactive to April 22, 1969, as provided by H.R. 13270. There was no indication by either the House Ways and Means Committee or the Nixon administration that a retroactive date would be in effect for these contracts. This is, therefore, especially unfair to donors who have provided for these kinds of contracts after that date.

4. Charitable gift annuities: The provisions concerning bargain sales, provided for in House Bill 13270 and enacted, should specifically state that the transfer of appreciated property for a charitable gift annuity is not a bargain sale. Under the present House bill, the transfer of appreciated property for a gift annuity could be construed as a bargain sale, the donor receiving an annuity rather than cash from the charitable institution. This long established form of giving should not be abolished. Most of our colleges hold a substantial amount of funds subject to gift annuity agreements. We believe that the failure to except gift annuities from the provision governing bargain sales must have been an oversight by the House Ways and Means Committee. We urge you to provide for that oversight.

5. Abolishing of the income tax charitable deduction for gifts of partial interest in property [section 2101(a)(3), p. 121, line 8]: We assume that this portion of the House Bill is intended to deny a charitable deduction to a donor for the fair rental value of property which the donor allows a charity to use rent free. However, the language of this section of the bill has us concerned, inasmuch as it could be interpreted to abolish a deduction for gifts of undivided interest in real property as well as for gifts of remainder interest in real property. If the Senate wishes to deny a deduction for the use of property, we would urge you to rewrite the House provision so that it does not include gifts of real property subject to life estates and gifts of undivided interest in real property.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 13270

We support and commend Congress for many of the provisions in House Bill 13270. Some of these also affect charitable giving. Three items in particular come to our attention:

1. We support you in eliminating Clay Brown transactions. We believe organizations should be taxed on income received from debt-financed investments.

2. We believe that organizations now exempt from tax should be taxed on unrelated business income.

3. We applaud Congress on its attempt to encourage charitable giving, to organizations serving the national good, by increasing the ceiling on gift deductions to 50 percent.

CONCLUSION

The colleges and universities of the state of Washington are dependent upon gifts for their support and continued growth. A substantial portion of these gifts come in the form of appreciated property. An increasing amount comes in the form of deferred giving programs, which include charitable remainder trusts, life income contracts, and gift annuities.

If the House Bill is passed, these gifts to our institutions will be greatly reduced. At a time when Congress is seeking ways to assist higher education in meeting heavy financial needs, it is inconceivable to us that tax law should be passed which would make it impossible for us to help ourselves. Now is the time to increase tax incentives, not decrease them. Congress has continually, over a long period of time, liberalized tax law to encourage gifts to our institutions. And each time Congress has indicated that any tax revenues lost were more than made up for by the good which these charities provided in the national interest. We urge you not to reverse that magnificent record.

The Independent Colleges of Washington are making a substantial contribution in preparing leadership for our nation. Were they to cease to exist, the burden of educating these young people would have to be carried by our state institutions, at the cost of an enormously increased tax burden for our citizenry.

A charitable deduction should not be thought of in the same terms as are other deductions. The philanthropically-minded person does not give up his money and property for personal gain, but rather to help our institutions to provide for others—and for the good of the nation. Although he is not motivated solely by tax advantages, these tax advantages do assist by making it easy to give and by allowing him to give larger amounts than might otherwise be possible.

Provisions in the House Bill which have to do with charitable giving, both directly and indirectly, are extremely complicated. Our institutions have succeeded in increasing their gift support by making it easy for the donor to give. The very complex nature of the House Bill will tend to discourage our donors from giving.

Again, we wish to support Congress in its desire to reform tax law. We urge you, however, to protect those long established tax incentives which have enabled America's charities, colleges, and universities to show compassion and concern, to educate, to teach and build—and indeed to share with you, and with all America, the task of building a better and a greater America.

CONTRADICTION IN FEDERAL POSTURE ON MEDICAL EDUCATION

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on September 4 last, President Morris Thompson of the Kirksville College of Osteopathy and Surgery wrote me:

> It seems to me that the contradiction in federal posture is so evident as to be ridiculous and to call for Congressional correction.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from President Thompson be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

The "contradiction in Federal posture" referred to by the President of the Kirksville College of Osteopathy and Surgery concerns the appropriations request of the administration for loans and scholarships for the fiscal year 1970 for the health profession's student loan and scholarship program and the House action on that request.

The Johnson administration requested $20 million for the loan program. The Nixon administration reduced this to $15 million and recommended an increase of about $5 million in the scholarship program.

Although $15 million was appropriated for the loan program in both 1968 and 1969, the actual amount used by means of the revolving fund was some $26 million in each year.

Only about $1 million now is left in the revolving fund; thus what actually would be available for loans in 1970 under the administration request is slightly more than half that in previous years.

With a new and expanded class of freshmen coming into the medical schools and those who commenced 3 years ago not having completed their training, the loan fund will not meet the expectations of many students who had

counted on it. Earlier in the year when the administration announced the cutback, it was stated that the students could expect financing from the guaranteed loan program of the Office of Education; but tight money and increased interest rates do not now make that a realistic possibility.

The matter also has been somewhat compounded by the House action. When the administration announced a cutback on the loan budget request, it tempered that with the announcement that $15 million would be added to the scholarship fund. Some projected allocations were made and also some commitment—this in the early spring in an effort to stabilize expectations for September enrollment.

When House Appropriations acted on the bill, it decided that if enough funds were not available it would be better to put the $5 million scholarship fund into the loan category.

This would appear questionable, in the light of scholarship commitments already made. Moreover, the shifting of the $5 million to the loan fund is merely a recommendation of the House committee report, since the bill itself does not carry a line item breakdown on the funds.

On the House floor, an amendment was offered which would have increased the health profession's student loan fund by $14 million; but it was defeated.

The pertinent appropriation bill is now in the Senate committee, and we understand there is a good chance this loan fund will be increased.

It would appear somewhat incongruous to encourage the able but less affluent to become health professionals, thereby increasing the needed number of doctors and dentists; and then cutting back the funds essential to that end.

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

KIRKSVILLE COLLEGE OF OSTEOPATHY AND SURGERY,
Kirksville, Mo., September 4, 1969.

Hon. STUART SYMINGTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SYMINGTON: I am enclosing a copy of a resolution adopted by the American Association of Osteopathic Colleges in its annual meeting in July. It seems to me that the contradiction in federal posture here is so evident as to be ridiculous and to call for Congressional correction.

We are properly making better health care available for more of our citizens through various federal programs. We are properly urging that opportunities for entering the professions related to health be made available to young men and women from low income and disadvantaged families. We are concerned about the shortage of physicians in general and the handicap which this places on our progress toward our national health goals. We are spending many millions of dollars for construction of facilities both for M.D. and D.O. medical education and for hospitals and related facilities.

Yet in this very season, we reduce by half the available loan funds for the needy students whom we have encouraged to enter professional education to assist with the solution of all of these problems and the accomplishment of these goals.

I urgently request your careful attention to this problem and your help.

Yours sincerely,

MORRIS THOMPSON,
President.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, there exists in the United States a marked shortage of practicing physicians, and

Whereas, various federal loan and scholarship programs have made careers in osteopathic medicine and other health professions available to many economically deprived students, and

Whereas, many students enrolled in osteopathic colleges in the sincere belief that such loans and/or scholarships would continue.

Therefore, be it resloved that the American Association of Osteopathic Colleges regards the recent precipitous reduction in health professions loans and scholarships as a definite detriment to the ultimate health care of the American public.

DRAFT REFORM

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the present Selective Service System is in grave need of change. It is patently unfair. Therefore, I wish to voice my support for the President's objective of a voluntary draft and for the leadership in the area furnished by the distinguished Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD). I can only express my regret that Congress has abdicated to the executive branch its primary responsibility to make much needed reforms in the draft. It is my great hope that the administration will find some way to eliminate draftees from service in Vietnam unless they volunteer.

The present draft laws unnecessarily disrupt the lives of nearly 2 million young men who reach military age each year. It often interrupts the educational process or puts those who choose not to go to college at a disadvantage, and it encourages avoidance. In short, our present draft laws are inequitable and unreasonable, and we should do all we can to eliminate their deficiencies.

President Nixon's message to Congress on the draft last May was an encouraging sign and a positive indication of his leadership in making the necessary reforms. I hope the President will do everything in his power to bring about these changes in the near future.

At the same time, I regret having to rely solely on the Executive to amend inequities in an area that should have been dealt with by Congress. The problems of the draft have been known to us for a long time. These problems have been reinforced by the college-age students during the past year. Hence, it is hard to understand why Congress voted in June 1967 to extend for 4 years the present draft laws despite demands for change by millions of Americans.

I do not mean to suggest that we should dismantle our military manpower machines and risk our national security. But it seems to me that our national security is better served by a system that encompasses an essential basic fairness.

Congress should take the lead in making it so.

THE CHALLENGE OF THE SEVEN SEAS

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, Mr. James M. Hannan, president, Navy League of the United States, in his message published in Navy, the magazine of seapower for September, paid tribute to those men who go to sea in the ships and vessels of our Navy, Coast Guard, merchant marine, and fishing fleet. Mr. Hannan quotes from "Challenge of the Seven Seas," written by my colleague from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL).

I ask unanimous consent to include the text of Mr. Hannan's message in the RECORD.

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

THE SEA BREED

(By James M. Hannan)

"Honor the 'Sea Breed' for on them the wealth and security of the nation depend." Sen. Clairborne Pell "Challenge of the Seven seas."

To properly pay due honor to the seafarer, we must understand that the evidence of distinction is not in the uniform, the apparel of their profession.

In the Armed Services, we recognize generally a serious dedication, earnest motivation and a high sense of patriotism. But do we identify the human being who also is a citizen, a taxpayer, a consumer, a social security number, such as you and I?

The corporate body of the naval establishment, as other American organizations, demands highly professional and well trained people. The profile of these citizens of the sea, for the most part, is similar to any representative civilian group. Though uniformed, they serve in specialized capacities and, as in any organization, whether General Motors or the Navy, it is the people who make it go. This human element is the common denominator of productive performance for military and civilian alike. With a rigid training process, self motivation, spurred by keen competition, results in varying levels of achievement.

The "Sea Breed," attuned to sharp challenge and sudden change, is subject to perhaps a harsher selection. Survival at sea requires ingenuity and alert attention to the adverse elements of nature encountered. The environment constantly tests the seafarer. Endurance, courage and creativity are needed to meet the daily demands. The level of performance demanded regularly generates the remarkable above-the-routine accomplishment.

A combat trained naval aviator took the first bouncing and tentative step on the surface of the moon. History records that on July 21, 1969, Neil Armstrong consummated Project Orbiter, a study initiated by the Office of Naval Research in the 1950's, which served as the scientific foundation for the entire American space effort.

THE PRESIDENTIAL SEA BREED

A suitable "high point" for a review of contributions by the "Sea Breed" is the presidential role. For the early naval background of recent presidents is clearly etched in many of their momentous actions. Kennedy gained his great moment in history through his consummate strategic skill in the Cuban Blockade that resulted in the Soviet backdown. Lyndon Johnson turned the attention of the nation to the oceanic opportunities with the historic legislation for the Sea Grant Colleges and the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act. President Nixon now formulates a new oceanic doctrine girded by goals of a "Navy second to none" and his promise to "revitalize the American Merchant Marine." Each shows signs of a sailor's grasp of strategy. They also highlight what an understanding of the oceans means to the Commander in Chief in his history making moments.

Similarly, the congressional role adds noble lustre to this naval contribution. In the Senate are Warren Magnuson of Washington, powerful maritime champion, and Pell, co-sponsor of the Sea Grant Program.

William Bates of Massachusetts, until his recent death, was ranking Republican on the House Armed Services Committee. William Mailliard, of California is a key figure in the formulation of the Administration's maritime program.

The diplomatic role, always an adjunct to an exercise of naval command, comes easily to naval leaders. We find that Admiral Spruance served with distinction as the Ambassador to the Philippines; as did Admirals George Anderson in Portugal, Leahy in Vichy, France, Wright in the Republic of China, and Kirk and Standley in Moscow.

NAVAL SCIENTIFIC ACHIEVEMENTS

The scientific achievements of naval people are noteworthy. The works of Maury in oceanography are legendary. Admiral Byrd was first to fly over the North Pole in 1926. Three years later he flew over the Earth's southernmost point. His Antarctic expeditions netted a rich harvest of scientific data in meteorology, geophysics, geology, biology and physiology. Michaelson, a Naval Academy graduate and Nobel Prize winner, gained renown from his experiments in light that had direct bearing on the Einstein Theory of Relativity.

Rickover, in harnessing the atom for maritime propulsion, initiated a revolution in the naval role and potentially in all water-borne transportation for the years to come.

The Navy spearheaded revolutionary progress in communications. Lieutenant Bradley A. Fiske, even before the Marconi success, was experimenting with radio. Dr. Hoyt Taylor, a navy scientist, discovered the beam phenomenon of radar.

From John Paul Jones' expression of intent to go in "harm's way" to Armstrong's historic first step on the surface of the moon, the rigors, the rewards and the courage, embodied in an adventurous pioneering spirit, have produced the image conveyed by the "Sea Breed."

During these critical times when men in uniform are called upon for self sacrificing service, the understanding and support of the citizens logically would be anticipated. But, instead, an insensitive lack of appreciation is observed. Rather than continuing the hysterical harassment of the military-industrial complex in an effort to degrade our military people and their leadership, recognition of their service is required.

Not long ago we read in The Washington Post that "Rep. Clarence D. Long (D-Md.) has suggested to Melvin R. Laird, Defense Secretary, that he investigate the Navy with a view toward shaking up its high command."

This suggestion has been offered despite the fact that Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, the Chief of Naval Operations, enjoys the highest credentials of worldwide command responsibility. A tough minded leader of men, he has borne with singular impressiveness the task imposed upon him by a rapidly aging globally deployed fleet continuously called upon to meet the recurrent crises of a tension filled world.

I would suggest that we heed the lessons of history which teach us that sea forces provide the moral fibre of our national strength at sea and certainly deserve recognition and full support of a concerned nation.

Reposing in the hands and hearts and minds of those seafaring people is the maritime strength which this nation needs to protect its citizens, its shores, its worldwide commitments and economic well-being. This seagoing segment of our society we affectionately and respectfully term the "Sea Breed."

EFFECT OF TAX BILL ON MUSEUMS AND ART GALLERIES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, since the House of Representatives passed the tax reform bill, I have received expressions of concern from officials of many museums and art galleries over the possible effects of certain provisions of that measure on the future financing of their institutions.

I think there is no question that most of our museums are badly underfunded, that many museums are barely surviving on inadequate budgets. There is at the same time, I believe, general agreement that museums play an important role in enriching the lives of millions of Americans.

I believe, therefore, that the possible effect of proposed tax reform provisions on our museums deserves careful analysis. Kyran M. McGrath, director of the American Association of Museums, testified this week before the Committee on Finance on the impact of the reform bill on museums. I believe that Senators will find his analysis of interest. I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF KYRAN M. MCGRATH, DIRECTOR, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF MUSEUMS, CONCERNING THE TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to appear today and provide information regarding the effects the Tax Reform Act of 1969 would have on museums, as you requested in your letter of August 26, 1969, in three principal areas:

1. The appreciated value of donated, tangible, personal property.

2. The 7½ percent on private foundations as they relate to privately supported museums.

3. The charitable contribution limits for privately supported museums as compared to public supported museums.

As a brief introduction, the American Association of Museums was formed in 1906 as a national organization to represent museums and promote them as cultural and educational centers in the United States. Over 1,065 museums belong to the Association. They represent the three major disciplines within the museum profession: art, history, and science, as well as children's museums, university and college museums, planetariums, and general museums which combine operations among these disciplines.

APPRECIATED VALUE OF DONATED, TANGIBLE, PERSONAL PROPERTY

H.R. 13270 applies a tax consequence on the appreciated value of donated, tangible, personal property. According to the August 2, 1969 accompanying report issued by the House Committee on Ways and Means, donations of paintings and other objects were cited as some of the items frequently given to charities and that some of these items had appreciated in value. True, and usually the appreciation was due to the public acceptance of the items as something of artistic, historic, or scientific value. The more valuable, the more the public interest in it and the more reason it should be brought into the public forum such as in a museum where it will be properly cared for and adequately exhibited. As I indicate below, 90% of museums are barely able to meet operating costs and have no funds left over for acquisitions. These museums depend on donations and gifts for acquisition of the objects exhibited to the public.

Two weeks ago, I attended the annual meeting of the Mountain Plains Museums Conference in Canyon, Texas. Professional museum personnel from Montana to Texas met in the Panhandle Plains Historical Museum. That museum has excellent, valuable exhibits on American history as it unfolded on the Plains states. The director, C. Boone McClure, told me every item in that museum had been donated and that no funds existed in his budget, past or present, for acquisition. The value of exhibits like that are not in the dollar amount they may bring in the open market. The value in that case is in the object itself, as an object of historic importance. H.R. 13270 appears to treat such objects as of commercial value only, requiring the donor to choose between deducting the cost to him or the fair market value provided he include the appreciation in his income.

Last year museums received over 560 million visits from the public. These visits were made to view the exhibits on display and learn from them. Exhibits consist of 1) objects of art, such as paintings and sculpture, 2) objects of historical significance ranging from tools and equipment used by our forefathers, to the restoration of buildings notable in our national heritage, and 3) objects of scientific value such as systematic collections involving biological specimens, anthropology, zoology, botany, to more singular scientific exhibits such as those depicting heart transplants, space technology, and basic principles of physics. The objects exhibited in American museums have become extremely popular to Americans, as evidenced by the skyrocketing attendance figures in recent years. The demand of museum visitors for more and more cultural and educational value in exhibits has placed a tremendous burden on museums to improve upon the quality of exhibits. This means that museums are constantly seeking new acquisitions to meet these demands and further extend the educational value of the displays and the quality of exhibits.

THE 7½-PERCENT TAX ON PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS WOULD APPLY TO MANY PRIVATELY SUPPORTED MUSEUMS

The bill, in its present form, would apply a tax of 7½% to private foundations. The definition of a private foundation, contained in section 509 (page 15 of the bill) would include many museums. The museums which would be included are those which do not qualify under section 170(b) as publicly supported charities and which receive most of their income from private endowment income. I cannot speak with knowledge on the private foundations, but I can state that many of the museums in America were established by wealthy individuals who wanted to benefit the public in their communities by building a museum to serve the cultural and educational needs of the people living there. These museums are nonprofit, open to the public on a regular schedule, professionally operated, and exist to serve the public. The fact that the generosity which created them outstrips the formula expressed on pages 15 and 16 of the bill should not deny their value to the public.

A tax of 7½%, or even 2% as proposed two weeks ago by the Administration, on the investment or endowment income of these museums would work a very severe hardship. This is a critical matter. Up to 90% of museums are barely able to meet their increasing costs and do not have money left over for acquisitions. This bill, as it now stands, would apply a 7½% tax on their already inadequate endowment incomes. The result will have to be an equal reduction in operations and services to the public at a time when the public demands on museums are skyrocketing.

Those museums which are publicly supported or which can otherwise meet the formula in section 509 of the bill would not be affected by this new tax. But those museums which receive more than one third of their income from endowments would be affected. We are concerned that the test applied by the House looks to the source of funds for museums rather than to the edu-

cational and cultural services they offer the public.

Congressman Brademas said August 7, 1969: "Mr. Chairman, the test for equitable tax treatment of America's museums by the Federal Government should not rest on the source of funds so much as on the museum's service to the public. By treating museums for tax purposes like private foundations, this bill will add further to the burdens of museums located in cities which are not able to afford financial assistance for museum operations. So I ask the question, Mr. Chairman: Is the museum a qualified, nonprofit institution, professionally staffed, making its exhibits available to the public on a regular schedule? If so, then it should be treated as a public charitable institution and specifically included in the appropriate provisions of H.R. 13270."

CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTION LIMITS FOR PRIVATELY SUPPORTED MUSEUMS AS COMPARED TO PUBLICLY SUPPORTED MUSEUMS

The bill as it passed the House of Representatives provides different treatment regarding charitable contributions between publicly supported museums which qualify under section 170(b)(1)(B) and privately supported museums which do not qualify. At present, 170(b) museums (publicly supported charities) are able to offer individual contributors a charitable deduction up to 30% of adjusted gross income. H.R. 13270 would increase this to a total of 50%. Also, at present, those museums which do not qualify under section 170(b), usually by reason of their private support, are only able to offer up to 20% to a prospective donor on a charitable contribution.

This distinction in limitations discriminates against privately supported museums. If anything, it places them in a handicapped position in the competition for private donations. These museums must compete with universities, colleges, hospitals, as well as publicly supported museums. Privately supported museums can only offer a donor a 20% charitable contribution, whereas, the other categories can offer up to 50%. If there is concern that some individuals might use such a museum to shelter personal income, and until a professional and proven system of museum accreditation is in effect, perhaps the fact that a privately supported museum might be able to meet the qualifications for an operating foundation under section 4942(j)(3) of the bill (p. 33) would suffice to assure that the organization is otherwise functioning for the public good and thereby entitled to the full 50% standing regarding charitable contributions. However, it is not at all clear as the definition of operating foundation now stands, that many privately supported museums would be able to qualify. This confusion centers on what definition is given the term "assets," under 4942(j)(3)(B)(i) and whether more than half of a total endowment or the endowment income must be devoted to the specified activities.

The service to the public may be and in many cases is identical: The museum is open to the public; it is answerable to a board of trustees responsible for seeing that it is operated for the cultural and educational advantages of the public; and it provides a genuine public service. One other item is usually identical with publicly supported museums; both types of museums are invariably desperate for money, and in 90% of the time, are totally dependent upon private donations for acquisition.

The concern that taxpayers will escape any taxation by way of such donations would be met by the House action to remove the unlimited feature of the charitable contribution provision to assure that at least 50% of a person's income would be included in his taxable income.

This is a very serious question to the entire museum profession, and especially to those privately supported museums. There are many of them in practically every state, and they are dependent, totally dependent upon private donations for their continued existence.

RISING COSTS OF OPERATION HAVE ERODED FINANCIAL STABILITY OF MUSEUMS

For years, the public was complacent that museums were operating quite well on their endowment incomes. But this complacency was shattered with the report submitted to the Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities last November: *America's Museums: The Belmont Report. The Belmont Report* described the effects of inflation and increasing public attendance and demands for more service. Operating costs had climbed much higher than endowment incomes were able to meet. Additional revenues had to be found from both public and private sources. This would be a weak argument if only a small segment of the public was concerned. But the United States Office of Education figures confirm 560,000,000 museum visits last year in the United States, indicating a large percentage of our public is involved. This study also showed that of 2,889 museums surveyed, 1,419 were wholly financed by private contributions. If there is doubt that the privately supported museums were not substantially involved in these 560,000,000 visits, more than 264,000,000 visits were made to privately supported museums.

Museums will drown in their own success, the public will suffocate them unless the public is willing to assist them directly through public appropriations or indirectly through tax encouragement of private support.

TRIBUTE TO MISS MARY FACKLER, REDLANDS, CALIF.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the 1969 San Bernardino County Fair was dedicated to the city of Redlands, Calif., and in particular to the memory of a humble schoolteacher, Miss Mary Fackler.

This patriotic Redlands educator played a little known but significant and fascinating role in our history. Miss Mary Fackler was one link in the chain of events that has resulted in our American custom of pledging allegiance to Our Flag on all patriotic occasions.

In 1892, Francis Bellamy, of Boston, originated the salute and used it as part of the city's Columbus Day celebration on the 400th anniversary of the discovery of America. Miss Fackler, a teacher of the primary grades in Redlands, received a copy of the program for the Boston celebration by mail and was deeply impressed with the significance of the salute. She taught it to her pupils and used it as an incentive to good behavior by letting the children recite the salute at the end of a day when no one had been absent or tardy. A child who had done especially well in his work was allowed to hold the flag.

Among the pupils in the school were the three children of Lt. Col. H. W. Lawton. On one occasion their friend, Gen. Joseph C. Breckinridge, was with the Lawtons in Redlands, and Mrs. Lawton took him to visit the children's school.

General Breckenridge was much impressed by the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag as Miss Flackler had her pupils do it, and on his return to Washington, D.C., he introduced it to the Sons and Daughters of the Revolution at one of their conventions. Mrs. Lawton wrote to Miss Fackler, describing the first time the pledge was given in Washington:

> All the distinguished men and women in the East were there and he (General Breckenridge) had the children give the Salute, which was beautiful and impressive and created much praise, enthusiasm, and applause. It was mentioned as coming from the California children. I thought you would like to know it, since it is all owing to you.

Mr. President, the daily recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance in our schools has become a national custom which would surely be all the tribute Miss Fackler would want for herself. But I know Senators will want to join me in recognizing her imagination and enthusiasm. California and the country can be proud of Mary Fackler.

OIL IMPORT QUOTAS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, an article published in the September issue of Wisconsin's nationally known magazine, the Progressive, edited by Morris Rubin, offers a carefully written examination of the oil industry's import quotas and depletion allowance.

The article, written by Spencer Rich and entitled "The Power of Oil," is well organized and readable and gives the reader a concise presentation of the current interest in this subject. 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:

THE POWER OF OIL

(By Spencer Rich)

In the movies oilmen are usually pictured as tough, independent operators, fiercely individualistic, dependent on no one and accepting no interference—or handout—from the Government. The John Wayne image immediately comes to mind.

But that is not the picture emerging from a series of hearings on the petroleum industry held by Senator Philip A. Hart's Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee. There, a battery of oil industry spokesmen has pleaded that the vast system of Government subsidies—the extent of which has never before been detailed so completely to the public—must be maintained or domestic oil production will be unable to meet foreign price competition and will shrivel to a trickle.

The result, as pictured by men like Humble Oil's M. A. Wright, Sun Oil's Robert Dunlop, and the Independent Petroleum Association's Harold McClure, will be U.S. dependence on foreign suppliers. This nation would be forced to grovel, trembling, before petty Middle Eastern satraps, lest they cut off supplies of the vital juice.

That the industry profits handsomely from the 27.5 per cent depletion allowance has long been known. What has not previously been etched so sharply is the extent to which domestic oil companies reap subsidies from an additional system of economic aids generously provided by the U.S. Government and the states. As a series of professional economists suggested to the Senate subcommittee, the industry may actually take in three to five times as much each year from the workings of the oil import quota system as it does from the far more publicized depletion allow-

ance. The foreign tax credit adds still more money to the pot.

The oil import quota system was put into effect on a mandatory basis by President Eisenhower in 1959, under pressure from the Independent Petroleum Association of America, spokesman for the smaller independent oil and gas operators whose holdings are concentrated on U.S. soil and whose production costs are frequently far higher than those of the big international companies.

The quota limits crude oil imports in the eastern United States to 12.2 per cent of domestic production, with restrictions on imports to the western states also. Since the West is a "crude-deficit" area, with insufficient production to meet its needs, there is no percentage limit on imports. Instead, oil imports are simply limited to the difference between available domestic supply and anticipated need.

There are no limits on imports of residual fuel oil, provided it is not brought in for reprocessing. Residual is the heavy, thick product left after all other derivatives are taken out. It is used for heating large buildings and for electric power production. Overall, about one-fifth of the nearly five billion barrels of petroleum consumed annually in the United States comes from abroad. The rest is supplied from domestic production.

The professed purpose of the import limitations is to keep the domestic industry healthy, so that in case of a national emergency, or cutoff of foreign supplies the nation will have enough domestically produced oil to carry on. But many of the noted economists who testified at the Hart Subcommittee hearings—such as the waspish M. A. Adelman of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology—who clashed with Republican Senators, telling them all the Government's previous studies had simply been a justification for aiding the industry, and the cigar-chomping Walter Adams, acting president of Michigan State University, who looked like an oilman but talked like a populist—suggested that the import control system may simply be a handout to the industry which costs the public billions of dollars a year.

The import controls, along with ceilings imposed on domestic production by "market demand pro-rationing" systems in Louisiana and Texas, the states which together produce three-quarters of U.S. oil, limit oil supplies in this country and keep the domestic price far higher than the world market price.

The domestic price at the well is now about three dollars a barrel for crude oil. Transportation costs by tanker to the East Coast from Gulf of Mexico depots bring the price to wholesalers in the Northeast to about $3.50 a barrel or more. But witness after witness testified—and oil industry spokesmen conceded—that oil imported from the Middle East could be purchased on the East Coast of the United States for only $2 a barrel, *including* shipping charges from the Persian Gulf, provided the oil comes in under a quota. That is a differential of about $1.50 a barrel.

One ironic result of the import barriers is that foreign nations are able to buy oil far more cheaply than American consumers, and sometimes from the same U.S. companies. Thus, in the first half of 1968, when domestic oil prices—not including shipping costs to market—were around $3 a barrel for crude oil, the Japanese government was able to buy 2.3 million barrels a day of largely Middle East crude at prices averaging $1.42 a barrel. Standard Oil of New Jersey—an enormous worldwide company, two-thirds of whose 1968 sales were *outside* the United States—and other well known U.S. firms sell oil in Japan as well as in the United States.

How much could U.S. consumers save if low-cost foreign oil were allowed to enter freely? No one knows exactly, but the added cost to domestic purchasers under this system of artificially high prices was estimated *at a minimum* of $4 billion a year by M.I.T.'s Adelman, one of the nation's most respected economists in this field. Dr. John Blair, the subcommittee's able chief economist, came up with a calculation of about $7.2 billion a year. Even John Lichtblau, a private economist whose work is financed by several major oil companies, estimated the figure at $2.7 billion a year, and Wright of Humble Oil, which is Standard of New Jersey's chief domestic subsidiary, put it at $3.4 billion. Wright claimed offsetting domestic benefits such as domestic wages and taxes paid by the oil industry. He failed to mention that if these billions were invested in other needed enterprises, they would presumably create jobs and generate taxes there too.

What all this means, the shrewd Dr. Blair was quick to point out, is that the oil import program coupled with pro-rationing has, by inflating domestic prices, cost the nation *40 to 70 billion dollars in overcharges,* at wholesale, over the ten years since the quota system was made mandatory. These added costs were multiplied when passed along in retail sales of heating oil, gasoline, motor oil, electricity generated with oil, and oil-based chemical products.

Dr. Blair translated these overall figures into terms meaningful to the average consumer. He estimated that the average price of gasoline to consumers *would drop five cents a gallon if oil import quotas were abolished.* For the average car owner buying 700 gallons of gas a year, this would mean an annual saving of $35. Blair calculated that abolition of quotas could also bring a *3.9-cent reduction in the cost of home heating oil—an annual saving of about $58.50 for the homeowner with oil heat.*

In addition to the huge import quota bonanza, the 27.5 per cent depletion allowance, and the right to "expense" intangible drilling costs—charge off certain expenses as annual operating costs for Federal tax purposes rather than depreciating them over a long period—save the industry about $1.6 billion in Federal taxes yearly, according to a recent Treasury Department study.

Under the gentle but highly effective leadership of Hart, the Subcommittee chairman who was the only Senator present at every hearing, witnesses brought out some curious points about the privileged position of the oil industry. For example, oilmen claim that the depletion allowance is needed to stimulate domestic exploration for new oil reserves, so that an assured supply will always be available on this continent. But Treasury studies show that oil firms are allowed to claim the depletion allowance not only on domestic but on foreign operations as well. In fact, at least a quarter of the depletion claimed involves foreign holdings of U.S. companies. Thus, oil companies have a strong tax incentive to explore overseas as well as in the United States, and capital that might be invested here to give the nation its needed national security reserve is spent looking for oil on other continents.

The foreign tax credit enjoyed by the industry works much the same way. Witnesses testified that oil from the huge Middle Eastern pools costs only twelve to twenty cents a barrel to produce, including return on investment, and a big portion of the ultimate two dollars delivered cost in the United States consists of a "tax" of perhaps eighty-five cents a barrel levied by the host Mideast government.

Under present U.S. tax policies, the oil firm is entitled to deduct this entire eighty-five cent "tax," which many economists defined as simply a royalty under another name, not from taxable income but taxes payable to the United States on their overall profits. This tax credit gives oil firms another incentive to explore and operate overseas, rather than in this country.

These and other forms of favored treatment add up to a tremendous special system of public subsidies for the oil and gas industry which likes to portray itself as fiercely devoted to "free enterprise" and as fiercely opposed to "Government intervention." One result is that oil companies pay exceptionally low Federal taxes, though the industry is one of the nation's largest, with $60 billion in worldwide sales. Senator William Proxmire, Wisconsin Democrat, has cited Internal Revenue Service figures disclosing that only about half the industry's net income is subject to Federal tax, while the average figure for all other manufacturing concerns is ninety-seven per cent. Proxmire said reports filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission revealed that in 1968 oil refineries averaged only eleven per cent Federal tax on their actual earnings while other manufacturing firms averaged nearly forty-one per cent.

"The oil industry makes the Mafia look like a pushcart operation," Representative Bertram Podell, New York Democrat, charged recently in a letter to Chairman Wilbur Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee requesting abolition of the special tax benefits for oil companies. Podell released figures which he said showed that thirteen major oil companies, whose net incomes ranged as high as $2.3 billion last year, have been paying Federal taxes *at a rate lower than a taxpayer earning $4,000.* A man with that income is taxed at a twenty-two per cent rate on the average, Podell said; the thirteen oil firms had effective tax rates on net income of no more than twenty per cent in 1968 and twenty-one per cent in 1967.

Among these thirteen super-prosperous oil companies cited by the Congressman, Sinclair paid no Federal taxes at all last year—in fact it received a $2.7 million tax credit toward future taxes; Atlantic-Richfield paid no taxes for 1967; Gulf paid less than one per cent of its 1968 net income in Federal taxes; Standard Oil of New Jersey had a $2.3 billion net income last year and paid $224 million or 9.7 per cent in Federal income taxes. The oil industry's "passionate devotion to old fashioned virtues such as greed," said Podell, "is amazing."

When the hearings opened, Senator Hart said one of his chief concerns was whether the higher cost of oil in the United States because of import barriers was hurting other industries which depend on oil, petrochemicals being the chief example. Chewing on his cigar, the free-speaking economist, Walter Adams, said high oil prices here were "hopelessly disadvantaging" the U.S. petrochemical industry competing in world markets against producers in Japan and Germany, for example, who paid far less for their petroleum feedstocks.

In March, the chemical industry itself—which contributes $1.1 billion in overseas sales to reduce the balance of payments deficit—put out a handsome, glossy booklet complaining that oil import controls threaten its competitive position. It was sponsored by DuPont, Celanese, Monsanto, Union Carbide, and other chemical giants. There are those who relish the picture of the chemical corporate giants clashing head-on with Standard Oil, Gulf, and other oil industry mammoths.

Adams told the Hart Subcommittee that the political power of the oil industry, rather than national security needs, had brought the system of oil industry props into being. The power of the oil lobby is legendary. The industry has immense financial resources. It supports some highly effective trade organizations to represent it in the nation's capital.

Oilmen are generally numbered among the prime contributors to the two national par-

ties, though precise statistics are hard to come by. To give a few examples, Shell and Union Oil each bought $15,000 advertisements in the 1964 Democratic National Convention program book. Gulf bought a similar one in a 1965 Democratic program book, and Humble, Shell, American, and Union Oil all bought advertisements in the 1964 Republican convention book. At a recent $500 a plate Democratic dinner in Washington, I spotted lobbyists representing three of the top seven oil firms in the country

Texas is the biggest oil-producing state, which helps explain why Lyndon B. Johnson, while he was in the Senate (and on the House side Speaker Sam Rayburn), helped defeat all attempts to reduce the oil depletion allowance. The oil industry's benefits still have a powerful and effective defender: Senator Russell B. Long of Louisiana, another large oil producing state, who is chairman of the tax-writing Senate Finance Committee and who has repeatedly defended the industry in floor speeches this year. Long undoubtedly will work to block any substantial reduction in the depletion allowance. The depletion allowance has another friend in high places: President Nixon. During the campaign, he asserted outright that he supports the allowance.

In spite of this powerful support for the current depletion allowance, which was enacted forty-three years ago, the chances that Congress will reduce it are brighter this term than ever. There is a strong movement in both houses for tax reform, and the House of Representatives has even voted a reduction of the oil depletion allowance from 27.5 per cent to twenty per cent and to prohibit its application to foreign production. The reduction faces rough sailing in the Senate, whose Finance Committee is dominated by men who like the present allowance.

The oil industry's response to all the cries of "subsidy" levelled against it is that the whole system is justified by national security needs. Unless the United States is capable of producing some three-quarters or four-fifths of its annual needs, the argument runs, the nation will be at the mercy of foreign suppliers and subject to diplomatic blackmail and manipulation. If import barriers were removed and $2 foreign oil allowed to enter, the industry claims there would be a massive drop in U.S. production as less efficient operations failed to meet the competition and went out of business.

Worse still, the oil men argue, incentives to discover new oil here, at high cost, would disappear. Reserves, already down to an eight-year supply, would drop still further. Wright of Humble Oil estimated that with the import barriers removed, growing consumption coupled with declining discovery would leave the United States capable, at best, of producing only forty-six per cent of its needs by 1985, and therefore heavily dependent on imports.

The economists who testified at the first round of Senator Hart's hearings expressed considerable doubt about these assertions. To begin with, why national security requires that the United States must maintain domestic capacity at four-fifths of annual consumption is not clear. The figures, when originally set, were based more or less on the existing import levels; the computation smelled suspiciously like a simple hold-the-line device dressed up in national security clothing. The economists suggested that careful economic studies—none has ever been made, several claimed—might establish some lower figure as quite adequate.

In addition, it was pointed out that it is not necessary to maintain such a huge price differential to protect most U.S. oil production. Several witnesses argued that only a small proportion of U.S. oil production—perhaps as little as ten to fifteen per cent, or even less—needed the massive price protection established by the import quota system. The rest, it was emphasized, could compete quite well at a much lower price if inducements to waste and inefficiency which are built into the system were ended.

Senator Hart repeatedly advanced the position that if new U.S. deposits of oil are getting harder to find, while at the same time domestic needs are rising, the current system of limiting low-price imports not only raises the cost to consumers but also uses up our scarce domestic supplies faster and thereby undermines our national security position.

Would it not be cheaper, as well as more conducive to national security, Hart kept asking, to import more foreign oil now while it is available and save our liquid reserves for a crisis? Oilmen responded that for technical reasons it is difficult to save oil underground once a well has been opened. If the inefficient wells were put on a standby basis, many would never be able to produce again and the oil would be lost forever.

Hart also advanced the proposal that it might be possible, and much cheaper than the current expensive system, to develop new ways to tap oil reserves that would permit low-cost imports while maintaining a strong national security position. For example, referring to the 600 billion barrels of good-grade potentially recoverable oil to be found in shale deposits in Colorado (that would be 100 years' supply at current consumption rates), Hart asked whether an all-out research effort to reduce the cost of getting oil from shale would not be worthwhile. At present, shale oil is too costly for commercial use, and the industry says it would be economically impossible to count on it as an oil reserve. But the Government is spending only $13 million a year for all research on the development of oil from shale and from our immense reserves of coal. Even if it ultimately cost a billion dollars—or even two or three billion—to crack the problem of producing low-cost oil from shale, coal, and tar sands, that would still be less than a single year's added costs to buyers which results from the oil import quota system. In addition, the new sources would provide an enormous reserve of oil for national security purposes.

One Senator notably unimpressed by the national security argument was Edward M. Kennedy. He challenged industry witnesses to say what proportion of U.S. oil was helping to fuel our forces in Vietnam. They did not supply the answer. Former Assistant Secretary of Interior J. Cordell Moore, who was in the audience waiting to be called as an expert witness, told me that only a fifth, or a quarter, of Vietnam petroleum supplies comes from the United States.

Kennedy—arguing that oil from Canada, Venezuela, and other Western Hemisphere sources could be depended on in a crisis—also brought out that two-thirds of current U.S. oil imports do not come from the Middle East but from Canada and Venezuela. So the oft-cited threat that Middle Eastern nations could endanger the United States by cutting off supplies was pretty much a bogeyman, he implied.

The industry's national security argument is not entirely implausible. But it is not at all convincing without detailed economic studies to back up assertions of disaster. The President's Cabinet Committee Task Force on Oil Imports, which is headed by Secretary of Labor George Schultz, is to report in the fall or winter. It should take a really hard look at the security argument rather than swallow it whole as an excuse for handing more subsidies to an already enormously rich industry.

In the meanwhile, Senator Hart and his staff have done the public a great service in making clear, as Adams of Michigan State put it in quoting the conservative economist Milton Friedman, that: "Few industries sing the praises of the free enterprise system more loudly than the oil industry. Yet few industries rely so heavily on Government favors." These are favors that cost the U.S. Treasury billions in taxes which the oil industry does not pay and billions in higher prices paid for gas and oil by American consumers.

THE FIRST AMERICAN LEGION POST

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the American Legion this year celebrated its 50th anniversary of service to the United States. The first American Legion Post in the Nation to make application for a charter was the Ferdinand Branstetter Post No. 1, at Van Tassell, Wyo.

Probably not more than a few Senators have heard of Van Tassell, Wyo. It is located in Niobrara County, near Wyoming's eastern border, and the 1960 census showed that 15 people resided within its town limits.

This should tell us that it does not take a lot of people to make a lot of patriotism.

The Van Tassell American Legion Post applied for charter on June 28, 1919.

A historical marker was dedicated this month at Van Tassell in honor of the Nation's first post. The featured speaker at the dedication was Wyoming's Governor, himself a decorated veteran of World War II.

I ask unanimous consent that an article describing the dedication ceremony, published in the Lusk, Wyo., Herald of September 11, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

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

GOVERNOR SPEAKS FOR STRONG MILITARY AT DEDICATION

Gov. Stanley K. Hathaway, speaking at the dedication of the historical marker to the Van Tassell American Legion Post, said, "Those who hold to the theory of doing away with the military have short memories."

Gov. Hathaway, who was five times decorated for his World War II service, told the audience of some 125 that America can only preserve freedom by being strong and "We cannot allow a small percentage of young people to take that away." Too often we are told what is wrong with America when there are so many things that are right, he said. Gov. Hathaway praised the Legion, and its Auxiliary, for their work with young people mentioning the Junior Legion Baseball program and Boys and Girls State.

The historical marker which was financed by the Wyoming Recreation Commission stands within the Town of Van Tassell limits on the north side of Highway 20. The burned-in lettering was done by inmates at the Wyoming State Penitentiary. The land for the site was donated to the Legion by Andrew McMaster.

Mr. McMaster, although not a charter member of Ferdinand Branstetter Post No. 1, is among its oldest active members, and told stories of the early days of the Post.

HOW ORGANIZED

E. Cooper Calhoun, who was first Commander of the Post, told of the organization in a letter. Mr. Calhoun, because of health, was unable to attend.

Portions of Mr. Calhoun's letter follow:

"I got my discharge on June 15 (1919) at Ft. D. A. Russell. I arrived in Van Tassell that evening about 4 o'clock on the train.

O. I. Stinger met me at the depot and handed me a large envelope containing information about forming an American Legion Post. I started the next morning talking to every veteran I met—Floyd Deuel, Carl Dallam and Warren Jones, who helped me get the rest of them together Saturday afternoon June 28th. I had 27 men lined up. I called long distance to Lusk to Major Alfred Beach to ask him to come down that afternoon, which he did.

"We've always contended, based on statements made by Lem Bowls, National Adjutant, that we were the first Post to make application for a charter. There were four charters issued on the same day—Van Tassell Post No. 1; No. 2 Leo Leyden Post in Colorado; No. 3 Post in Washington, D.C.; and Pueblo No. 4 in Colorado. I can't get anyone in National Headquarters to verify this."

A large delegation of Legionaires from throughout Wyoming and Nebraska attended. Legionaires of Wieten-Dupes Post No. 4 of Lusk attended in a body and Commander Archie Lauer spoke. The N.C.H.S. Band, under the direction of Richard Pendleton, played.

Dr. R. R. Minghini of Rawlins, Department of Wyoming Commander, spoke briefly as did Bob Richards, Department of Nebraska Advocate General. Wyoming District Commanders Dale Havery and Walter Gregory and Irvin B. Selmer, Alternate of the National Executive Committee, were in attendance. Ed Baldwin, Commander of Post No. 1, gave the welcome and George Clarke of Lusk was master of ceremonies.

KEEP IN MIND THE BIG PICTURE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, much has been said with respect to the construction of the verbiage of the Genocide Convention. I feel that the large answer to all of the arguments against the convention is that courts always construe treaties, statutes, constitutions, in terms of the objective attained. Everyone knows that the genesis of the Genocide Convention was mass murder. And if you will consider the objective of the convention in terms of the goals to be attained—then it throws light upon many of the sections of the convention which have been criticized.

There is no question that so long as we have totalitarian governments who are committed to the destruction of their opposition there will be other groups who will be the objects of political and governmental attack. There was some discussion as to whether an effort could be made to check that problem, which is a very difficult problem, with this particular convention on genocide, but since these great political issues get into the whole field of political agitation, it was thought wise to limit this convention to the specific subjects of national, ethnical, racial, or religious groups. Dean Rusk, then the Deputy Under Secretary of State appearing before an ad hoc subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, stated:

> It is an attempt to single out that part of it which has been most vicious in the past, and which is fairly readily identifiable, and try to get on with that.

This convention is not all-encompassing. The suggestion is subtly made that race riots and lynchings may thus come under Federal power. It is clear from the legislative history of the language of the Genocide Convention that what was meant was not just embarrassment or hurt feelings, or even the sense of outrage that comes from such action as racial discrimination or segregation, however horrible those may be. What was meant was permanent impairment of mental and physical faculties on a mass scale of national, ethnical, racial, or religious groups.

If we keep in mind the big picture of what this convention establishes, I cannot see how we can fail to ratify this treaty.

GRANT CONSOLIDATION AND PROGRAM INFORMATION ACTS OF 1969

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, today approximately 420 Federal assistance programs are designed to provide State and local governments with over $20 billion for the purpose of meeting their pressing social and economic needs. While the assistance furnished through these programs is vital, the proliferation of such programs has itself created another set of problems these governments must solve. These problems are basically identifying what type of aid is available to State and local governments and cutting through the redtape and reams of paperwork required to obtain the Federal funds.

The Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of which I am a member, has been considering legislation which would facilitate State procedures for acquiring grants-in-aid and strengthen Federal management of them. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation.

The Grant Consolidation Act of 1969, introduced by the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), is one of the measures under consideration. This is an administration bill resulting from President Nixon's recognition of the need to revamp our present fragmented administration of closely related Federal assistance programs. This bill would provide the President with limited authority to consolidate various related grant programs and their administration. This consolidation would promote Government efficiency and coordination. It also would untangle the numerous procedures a locality must follow in applying for and receiving a Federal grant-in-aid.

The second bill I am cosponsoring is S. 60, the Program Information Act, introduced by the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BOGGS). This measure will complement the efforts the administration is now making to catalog the programs designed to provide Federal aid to State and local governments. The bill provides for the compilation of a catalog of Federal programs and the qualification requirements they bear. This catalog would be systematically revised and made available to the public on a regular basis.

Mr. President, these two measures are vital if Federal grants-in-aid are to be effectively administered and distributed to the localities which require them. I urge the Senate, therefore, to give them prompt consideration for enactment.

GREEK ARMED FORCES DISINTEGRATING?

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to an article entitled "Greek Armed Forces Disintegrating?" published in the Christian Science Monitor of August 29. The author of the article, Saville R. Davis, believes that the army is divided and humiliated and that Greece is no longer a "valuable military ally" of the United States.

I continue to be both saddened and concerned at the situation in Greece. The article is addressed to still another aspect of the situation in that country whose government, it seems to me, can no longer be considered an ally in any sense of the word.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 29, 1969]

BLOW TO NATO: GREEK ARMED FORCES DISINTEGRATING?

(By Saville R. Davis)

ATHENS.—The main reason for American support of the present Greek Government has been removed. The United States depended on the integrity of the Greek armed forces to support the Western military position here and to act as a bridge to the Turkish Army on the east flank of the NATO defense area.

The Greek Army no longer exists as a stable, organized force-in-being.

This is conceded by friends and opponents of the "colonels' government" that now controls Greece.

In three successive waves the colonels' regime has jailed, placed under house arrest, or exiled to remote villages large numbers of the nation's most-influential military leaders. Names and facts are listed below.

The remainder of the armed forces have been subjected to a systematic campaign which, the regime says, is necessary to protect the government against a coup. Critics call it a reign of organized terror, designed to eliminate opposition.

In either event, the Army is divided and humiliated and its effectiveness as an instrument of the Greek nation is broken. Higher officers who remain are not allowed to command. Lower officers who hold power are faced with a passive resistance they cannot overcome.

This is the picture gained from well-informed sources both tolerant of the regime and opposing it. If this picture is oversimplified, the main argument still holds: The battle for allegiance of the armed forces has torn and dismembered them.

It was the former stability of the Greek armed forces which made that country a valuable military ally of the United States.

It cannot be said that in trying to purge the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force the Greek regime has been carrying out its announced policy of "saving the country from falling into the hands of the Communists."

Most of the arrested military leaders had fought directly against the Communists when they attempted to seize power by force in 1946–49. They were the bulwark of Greece against Communist subversion.

One of them said, "Their offense against the present government was that they were broadly nonpolitical, but pledged to the Western institutions of freedom that were born in their land, and they detest the enslavement of a free and proud people by the present rule of dictatorship and martial law."

Some of them supported King Constantine in his abortive effort to overthrow the dictatorship.

FACT SHEET ON ARRESTS

A fact sheet on the arrest and detention of the military leaders follows:

In late February of last year the first group of retired officers was exiled. In July and August, when the government was campaigning for a referendum coming in September, a second major group of officers was arrested. This year, after celebrating the second anniversary of the colonels' coup in April, a third group was taken.

Methods: arrests were normally between two and three o'clock in the morning. Police cars surrounded the residences and in some cases searchlights illuminated the houses.

The officers were removed in most cases without explanation other than the charge of being "dangerous to public order and security." They spent different amounts of time in the central security detention cells, sometimes under primitive conditions.

Most of them were then escorted to an Aegean island, in some cases to remote mountain villages. There they were asked to report to the local gendarmerie at specified intervals.

Villagers were warned by the gendarmerie not to approach the officers. Adequate medical help was denied in at least two cases of serious illness.

Some of the third group were charged with trying to alienate officers on active duty from the junta and were brought under formal judiciary inquiry which is still in progress. Others were not charged, trials not scheduled, and in most cases the original period of detention extended.

IMPRISONED WITH CRIMINALS

Some of the officers are now in various prisons together with common criminals. They are not allowed to communicate with relatives or their lawyers.

Army officers not detained or arrested and still in active service have been subjected to surveillance by varied and intensive methods. These include the placing of informers in the lower ranks who report to the security forces on the statements and activities of their officers. They also include mail censorship and telephone tapping.

The result is said to be extensive and deep-lying demoralization, with no one able to be confident of who would support or oppose his position in the event of a showdown.

The ruling group is generally described as a small minority of men within the Army, coming largely from small village backgrounds, trained in intelligence and conspiratorial methods, and much tougher in their methods of seizing and holding power than at first was realized.

As the months passed under arbitrary rule and martial law, these methods became harder rather than easing. Because the "colonels" were a small minority seeking to eliminate the old leadership of the armed forces and to control the rest by a campaign of systematic and deliberate "terror tactics," they appear to have alienated large sections of the armed forces as well as to have controlled others.

TACTICS DEFENDED BY SOME

Friends of the regime argue that these tactics were necessary in order to compel hostile elements in the armed forces to obey the new government. Critics say these tactics are the prelude to the final destruction of freedom in Greece and that the regime does not dare to relax its use of terror tactics.

Arguing either way, it appears that the armed forces have themselves become a battleground in the struggle for power and that they are no longer the stable force that the United States counted upon.

Following is an incomplete list of arrested or exiled officers. The wartime record and experience of these officers, their outstanding training both in Greece and in the United States and their anti-Communist position is spread on the public record.

First group, February 1967:

Brig. Gen. Dimitrios Zafiropoulos, who had been second in command of an infantry division, who escaped in the Middle East during World War II and was severely wounded in action, had commanded the raiding forces and been assistant military attaché in London.

Brig. Gen. Andreas Hoerschelman, commanding general of the 20th Armored Division, who escaped from Greece during the German occupation, fought the Communists in 1946–49, served in NATO headquarters, and was top of his class in the Greek Military Academy.

Col. Demitrios Opropoulos, also top of his class, served in the Washington NATO staff, had an excellent combat record, and was promoted for bravery on the battlefield.

Col. Constantine Tzanetis, a highly respected senior artillery officer during the combat against the Communist guerrillas who became commanding officer of divisional artillery.

Col. Nicholas Zervoyannis, commanding officer of parachute school and the Greek officer with the largest number of parachute jumps, who escaped in the Middle East during the German occupation and fought against the Communists. Also navy commander Vardis Vardinoyannis.

SECOND GROUP IN JULY

Second group, July-August, 1968:

Lt. Gen. Antonakos, Air Force chief of staff who escaped in the Middle East during the German occupation, a fierce anti-Communist. Lt. Gen. K. Kolias, commanding general of the First Field Army and commanding officer of the raiding forces, who fought against the Communists.

Lt. Gen. George Peridis, a Ft. Leavenworth graduate who was twice promoted in the battlefield for bravery, was commanding general of the 3rd Army Corps, participated in the non-Communist guerrilla units during the German occupation, and fought the Communists in 1946–49. (General Peridis became seriously ill in exile, was hospitalized in Athens under guard, his hospitalization was discontinued before the conclusion of treatment, and he was sent into exile in May of this year.)

Rear Admiral Spanidis, representative of Greece at the SHAPE NATO headquarters, a submarine commander in World War II who escaped in the Middle East during the German occupation.

Brig. Gen. George Koumanakos, a Ft. Leavenworth graduate. (The cases of these last two officers were recently detailed in the American press in the Evans-Novak column.)

Gen. Kon. Koniotakis, who also represented Greece at the SHAPE NATO headquarters and had escaped in the Middle East under the German occupation.

EXILES ANNOUNCED

Col. Periklis Papathanasiou, a raiding forces combat officer who also escaped in the Middle East. Maj. John Demestichas, a field Army staff officer who fought against the Communists. Air Force Col. Tsasakos, who served with NATO, Navy Capt. Konofaos, who also served with NATO and escaped in the Middle East during World War II. Brig. Gen. Ch. Tsepapadakis, who was an instructor at the National War College and fought against the Communists. Maj. Bpissias, a brilliant young combat officer and an instructor at the Army War College.

Third group, May 1969: An official announcement which listed only 10 of the following said they were to be exiled for "activities directed against public orders." Two weeks later the junta said that a judicial inquiry was under way to determine responsibility for a movement against the regime.

Vice Admiral Avgeris, Navy chief of staff and chairman of the joint chiefs of staff, Lt. Gen. John Genimatas, commandant of the Army War College, director of a special group which developed the new organization of the modern Greek Army, Army corps commander, Army chief of staff who fought in Korea as well as against the Communists.

Lt. Gen. George Tsichlis, commanding general of an infantry division which had fought against the Communists. Vice Admiral Egolfopoulos, Navy chief of staff who served in NATO, who escaped in the Middle East and is one of the most talented and respected senior naval officers in Greece.

Maj. Gen. Vardoulakis, an officer with a brilliant war record, commander of an infantry division, participated during World War II in special wartime raiding forces missions from the Middle East against the Germans in the mainland of Greece and in the islands of the Aegean and fought against the Communists.

Brig. Gen. Const. Papageorgpou, commanding general of the military district of Athens, who fought both the Germans and Communists. Brig. Gen. Nicholas Demestichas, chief of staff of an Army corps who had fought the Communists.

Lt. Gen. Christos Papadatos, commanding officer of the military academy and commanding general of the Athens region. Brig. Gen. Dem. Papadopoulos, chief of staff of the Athens region, second in command of an infantry division.

RECORDS FULL OF HONORS

Navy Capt. Georg. Psalidas, who escaped in the Middle East. Brig. Gen. P. Panourias, commanding general of an armored division and Ft. Leavenworth graduate, who escaped in the Middle East, fought the Communists, and was wounded in action.

Colonel Kalamakis, chief of staff of an Army corps who served with NATO headquarters, fought in Korea and against the Communists. Colonel Kalamakis was decorated by the United States as a member of the 7th Cavalry in combat action against the North Korean and Chinese Communists. Brig. Gen. Balkos, a Ft. Leavenworth graduate, instructor at the War College, and a distinguished senior staff officer.

Col. Perivoliotis, regimental commander who fought the Communists. Brig. Gen. Bouras Anast, who served as assistant commander of an infantry division and with the Washington NATO mission, escaped in the Middle East, and fought the Communists.

Lt. Col. John Souravlas, who had escaped in the Middle East and been a raiding forces combat officer. Lt. Col. Drosoyannis, who was also a raiding forces combat officer and fought the Communists.

Col. George Tavernarkis, a regimental commander who fought the Communists. Finally, the following combat officers who fought against the Communists: Air Force Colonels Diakoumakos, Pierakos, and Papageorgiou, three distinguished Air Force commanders and staff officers, who escaped as young pilots in the Middle East during the German occupation.

MORE ARRESTED SINCE MAY

Army Col. Pipanikolaou, Lt. Colonels Chrisostalis, Bouras Anast, Vlachos Somarakakis, and Zajharopoulos. Majors Zervas, Maragakis, Moros, Yannopoulos, and Moustakzis, Captains Mathioudakis, Grivas, Zarkadas Alex. In addition Maj. B. Koqrkafas, an outstanding raiding forces officer, arrested in May 1969, is feared missing since the time of his arrest.

Since May, 1969, among those arrested are Colonels Bloutsos, Mitsovoleas, Tzanetis, Maj. Gen. Em. Kehagias, an infantry division commander, and Lt. Gen. Sof. Tzanetis.

Gen. Tzanetis was arrested while vacationing in the Island of Rhodes. He escaped from Greece during the German occupation, he commanded an infantry unit in Italy in World War II, he was commanding general of

the Army War College, he was vice chief of the National Defense General staff.

There are at least four young officers on active duty who during 1968 have been arrested in their units, court martialed, and are now serving sentences in various prisons. These are Lt. Charalamboulos (serving a 10-year sentence in the Koridalos Prison), Captain Zervopoulos (15 years in Egina Prison), Maj. Agelos Pnevmatikos (10 years in Korfu) and his brother Capt. Konst. Spnevmatikos (4 years in Kopidalos). There is positive evidence that these officers were subjected to severe tortures during the time of the investigations.

There are some hundreds of other distinguished officers of all ranks, who have been retired and removed from any position where their talents and their devotion to the mission of a modern soldier-officer in a free society, could be utilized for the defense of Greece and NATO.

Many of the United States-trained officers, have been purged, arrested, or exiled. The purge continues.

The Greek press gave names of about 300 officers in January and February, 1969, and 463 in July, 1969, who were promoted. A large investment of the Greek people and of the United States is lost. War experience, professional training, and devotion to the ideals of the free world could eventually vanish.

These "terror tactics" are being witnessed by the population with apprehension and anxiety. Friends and opponents of the dictatorship are disturbed to see the prestige of the Army questioned by the people.

In talking with many people, one quickly realizes that the uniform of the Greek officer, once a symbol of pride, has become a source of embarrassment and even an object of scorn.

This is a disturbing fact to all concerned since in today's world, tanks, ships, planes, and men in uniform are known to be worthless if not supported by the will of the people. This popular support is lacking today in Greece.

Combined with this is a very rapidly growing "anti-Americanism" which stems from the conviction of most people in Greece that the dictatorship exists in power only because of American toleration and support.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ESTABLISHES A CENTER FOR URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, one of the great universities in our Nation, the University of Southern California, has established a center for urban affairs. This center, which will offer B.A., M.A., and Ph. D. degrees in urban studies will educate students to become specialists in urban problems. As far as we know this is the first university in the Nation to grant interdisciplinary bachelor, master, and doctoral degrees in urban studies.

I am proud and honored to serve as a member of the board of councilors of the USC Council for Urban Affairs. As a nation we must solve our urban problems. I am confident that we will do so. USC is located in the center of one of the Nation's fastest growing urban areas and has always had a deep concern and interest in the problems of urban society. I know that this center will contribute much by providing us with the needed experts and research to better enable us to wrestle with these tough problems.

I ask unanimous consent that a news release, along with the names of the distinguished individuals on the board of councils, be printed in the RECORD.

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

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA NEWS RELEASE

LOS ANGELES.—A new Center for Urban Affairs, offering B.A., M.A., and Ph. D. degrees in Urban Studies, was established today by the University of Southern California to educate students to become specialists in city problems.

USC said it believes it will be either the first or one of the first universities in the nation to grant interdisciplinary bachelor, master, and doctoral degrees in urban studies.

First classes will start in the fall and seniors who have completed basic requirements can be graduated with the first bachelor of arts degree in urban studies in June, 1970.

The Center for Urban Affairs will emphasize interdisciplinary study and will draw upon all the university's faculty resources in the humanities, sciences, social sciences, and professional graduate schools.

The Center for Urban Affairs will be administered at first by a board of three professors:

Dr. William W. May of Palos Verdes Estates, Associate Dean of The Graduate School, chairman.

Dr. Bernard C. Abbott of South Pasadena, director of the Allan Hancock Foundation and chairman of the Biological Sciences Department.

Dr. Ira Miles Robinson of Los Angeles (90027), director of the Graduate Program of Urban and Regional Planning.

The board is seeking a full-time director for the Center and associate directors for the divisions of teaching, research, and community action.

The director and associate directors will have faculty appointments and will be chosen for their teaching and research abilities, Dr. May said.

"They will be functioning urbanologists and not just administrators," he said.

USC is convinced that urban universities must be actively concerned with the problems of urban society, Dr. Norman Topping, USC president, said.

He pointed out that USC, which will enter its 90th year in the fall and is the oldest and largest independent university in the West, has had a long history of deep involvement in urban affairs.

"For more than 30 years USC has supported major education, research and other programs and activities concerned with urban problems in southern California, the nation at large, and throughout the world," Dr. Topping said.

"We are ideally located in the heart of a vast and growing urban center and have the traditional flexibility and innovative powers of a private university.

"We are convinced that the university's role in relating to urban problems is to provide people with a sound educational background in the troubles of our cities, to conduct definitive research, and to identify problems and make recommendations as to their possible solution."

USC pioneered in the spring of 1968 in establishing the Urban Semester, a forward-looking course of study which got students out of classrooms and into the city as their laboratory.

It is now in its fourth term and has become a permanent part of the USC curriculum. It will be a required course for all students majoring in urban studies.

A Ph. D. has been approved in principle by The Graduate School faculty council, and several students are already enrolled in this program. Final approval of the doctoral degree is expected soon.

A proposal for a master of arts degree will be submitted to the council early in the fall.

The Urban Semester and the degree programs got their start under auspices of the Institute of Urban Ecology on the campus. The Institute's work in the future will be incorporated in the new Center for Urban Affairs.

BOARD OF COUNCILORS OF USC CENTER FOR URBAN AFFAIRS

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES

Mr. Stanley M. Stalford, Chairman of the Board of Councilors; Chairman of the Board and President, Fidelity Bank and First Fidelity Company, 9570 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, California.

Mr. Norman Barker, Jr., President, United California Bank, 600 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, California.

Mr. Morris Crawford, Jr., Chairman of the Board, The Bowery Savings Bank, 110 East 42nd Street, New York, N.Y.

Mr. Harold Gleason, President, Franklin National Bank, 410 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

The Honorable James M. Hall, Superintendent of Banks for State of California, 120 Montgomery Street, Suite 1375, San Francisco, California.

Mr. Joseph S. Kaiser, President, The Williamsburgh Savings Bank, One Hanson Place, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Chairman of the Board of Lay Trustees, Fordham University; Member of the Banking Board of the State of New York.

Mr. Raymond Lapin, President, Federal National Mortgage Association, Washington, D.C.

Mr. William Levitt, Chairman of the Board, Levitt & Sons, Lake Success, New York.

Mr. Frederick Levy, Jr., Vice Chairman of the Board, Fidelity Bank and First Fidelity Company, 9570 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, California.

Mr. Frank E. Mackle, Jr., President, The Deltona Corporation, 3250 S. W. Third Avenue, Miami, Florida; Director, W. R. Grace & Co.; Member, Board of Lay Trustees, University of Notre Dame.

Mr. Hal Mendon, Director & Chairman, Executive Committee, First Fidelity Company, 9570 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, California; Senior Executive Vice President, Retired, United California Bank; Director, Beneficial Standard Corporation; Director, Investors Mortgage Insurance Company.

Mr. Alfred Mills, President and Trustee, New York Bank for Savings, 2nd and Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.; Chairman of Urban Affairs, City of New York; Treasurer and Member of Board of Trustees, Urban America, Inc.

Mr. Raymond T. O'Keefe, Executive Vice President, The Chase Manhattan Bank, One Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

Senator George Murphy, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Carmen Pasquale, Executive Vice President, Gersten Construction Company, 110 West "C" Street, Suite 809, San Diego, California; Formerly: Assistant Commissioner for Field Operations, in charge of all FHA offices. HUD's representative for billion dollar Mortgage Investment Program of the Life Insurance Industry for ghetto areas. U.S. State Department, First Consul and First Secretary in Paris, France; Bonn, Germany; New Delhi, India; and Montreal, Canada.

Mr. Robert Pease, Executive Director, Allegheny Conference for Community Development, 200 Ross Street, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Mr. William Slayton, Executive Vice President, Urban America, Inc., 1717 Massa-

chusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.; Formerly: Commissioner of the Urban Renewal Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Congressman John Tunney, Washington, D.C.

Mr. King Upton, Senior Vice President, The First National Bank of Boston, 67 Milk Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

Mr. Milford Vieser, Chairman of the Finance Committee, Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Company, 520 Broad Street, Newark, New Jersey; Chairman of Finance Committee, First National State Bank of New Jersey; Formerly, President, Newark Chamber of Commerce.

Dr. Robert C. Weaver, President, The Bernard M. Baruch College, The City University of New York, 17 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.; Director, The Metropolitan Life Insurance Company; Director, The Bowery Savings Bank; Formerly, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

CIVIL RIGHTS CONFUSION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on August 28, two of the most distinguished newspapers in the Nation, the New York Times and the Washington Post, editorialized on the same subject—school desegregation and the uncertainties caused by the Nixon administration's equivocal and contradictory actions and statements. Inasmuch as many Members of Congress were out of town when these editorials appeared and may have missed them, I think it would be appropriate to have them printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Both editorials refer to the latest desegregation retreat by the administration—the intervention of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on the side of recalcitrant Mississippi school districts in support of a further delay in desegregation. Parenthetically, I should like to point out that we are now in the 15th year since the Supreme Court ruled that racially segregated dual school systems are unconstitutional and must be eliminated. Yet they still exist in parts of the Nation.

Mr. President, for the information of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives who may not have read them, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 28, 1969]

THE SCHOOL DESEGREGATION MESS

Ever since the Nixon administration took office, people have been trying to figure out what its policy was on school desegregation. Only recently has it become evident that the exercise was doomed to failure because there was (and is) no policy. The precariously balanced official statements put out by the administration on the subject, with all their mutually cancelling clauses and paragraphs, have taken form in real life as a series of zigs and zags, swerves and screeches, threats and retreats—a kind of stock car race to nowhere that is far too arbitrary and ad hoc and politically accident-prone to be characterized as policy at all.

The best construction that can be put on any of this—and has been from time to time by Secretary Finch—is that the administration means to deal with the complexities of school desegregation on a case-by-case basis that takes full account of individual district's problems and needs. Even in theory, however, the merit of this approach is more apparent than real. As John Gardner and others warned from the beginning, any substantial deviation from the body of precedent, practice, and law that had come to be controlling in HEW's considerations, was bound to invite resistance, encourage political pressures, and replace the momentum that was gathering with chaos. Moreover, they argued, there was plenty of room in the policy that had been adopted for reason and compassion to come into play in special individual cases. They were right, as it seems, on both points. The prospect they warned of has been realized.

The bizarre events surrounding the administration's dealings in the state of Mississippi are the latest example of how things are coming unstuck. Incredibly, Secretary Finch a short while back intervened in a critical court case on the side of Mississippi and against his own Office of Education which had submitted school plans for 30 districts—plans meant to effect more than token desegregation by this fall. The heat which had brought about this extraordinary move must have been intense: none other than Jerris Leonard, the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, appeared in Jackson to argue the case against OE's position and for delay. Understandably, the proceedings tore it with the Legal Defense Fund, which had thought it was in court with the government. And the Mississippi debacle is apparently what also finally triggered the uprising of discontented attorneys in the Department of Justice who are now filling a protest of their own. Doubtless, the administration is onto a surefire thing, in the sense that school desegregation has never been what you would call a very popular issue, and it is getting less popular every day. But the administration would do well to consider whom it is hurting most by its actions. Like those courageous white Southerners who put their reputations on the line in their communities to argue the practical wisdom and necessity of compliance, the Legal Defense Fund and the cadre of Civil Rights lawyers at Justice are part of a dwindling band of men and women who have persisted in a sound cause against a rising tide of black and white separatism. It is they—in the face of violent and voguish extremes—who have continued to make the unpopular case for the acceptance and/or promotion of integration via the orderly processes of law. And it is they who are being repudiated by these actions: the white Southerners who told their communities that desegregation must come about, the civil rights workers who gave assurance that justice was attainable through law. It is not just the unseemly performance of the administration in this and related episodes that is so distressing. It is the gathering evidence that for a short-term gain, the administration is willing to do incalculable damage to those it should regard as its best friends and most worthy allies for the long haul.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 28, 1969]

FASTER SCHOOL DESEGREGATION?

In the absence of a clear policy statement by President Nixon himself, the progress of school desegregation becomes increasingly shrouded in uncertainties, confusion and suspicion. The extraordinary protest action by half of the staff lawyers in the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division against what they consider a retreat from energetic enforcement of the established guidelines gives substance to growing fears that segregationist pressures from the South may be triumphing in Washington.

Read against this background, the forecasts by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare that the beginning of the school year will see a dramatic increase in the integration of Southern Negro children into formerly all-white schools assume some of the characteristics of an effort to deflect attention from retreats in specific areas.

If these optimistic, over-all projections do prove accurate, much of the credit will belong to the administrators of the department's office for Civil Rights under both Presidents Johnson and Nixon. The guidelines developed and enforced after the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 gave momentum to Southern school desegregation, which had been held to a snail's pace by court's skirmishes and other forms of resistance in the first decade following the Supreme Court's historic mandate in 1954. The Nixon Administration's shift from direct administrative action to renewed litigation can only be interpreted as a slowdown move.

Indeed, the recent Administration decision to grant Mississippi another delay in eliminating dual school systems feeds apprehension that Southern anguish over unseemly haste—fifteen years after dual systems had been held unconstitutional—is getting undeservedly sympathetic attention. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People may have overstated the case in charging that, by its action in Mississippi, "the United States Government for the first time has demonstrated that it no longer seeks to represent the rights of Negro children." But, in disavowing its own desegregation plans at least for the coming school year, Washington has clearly put Southern political pressures ahead of forward movement on the integration front.

In view of the suspicions this postponement has aroused, it becomes particularly important that the enforcement targets set by Leon E. Panetta, director of the Office for Civil Rights, are actually met. Success along these lines would do much to lend credence to official assurances that special difficulties of timetable and administration in Mississippi will not be allowed to encourage foot-dragging elsewhere or to turn the Mississippi delay into eventual surrender.

However, Mr. Panetta's candid acknowledgement that high-placed policymakers inside the Administration have urged greater laxity makes it plain that the effectuation of the guidelines would be helped if the President himself set forth both principle and policy. There should be no obscurity about the wholeheartedness of White House support for swifter movement toward full school desegregation, North and South.

GLUE SNIFFERS GROUNDED

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, we live in a day when concern over the youth of our Nation is at a peak.

Never before have young people been exposed to so many elements of mental and physical danger, and never before have the young been allowed such a degree of freedom.

In the past several years, parents, educators, jurists, and legislators have addressed themselves with growing frequency to such problems as the spread of pornography and the increasing use of dangerous drugs.

The "generation gap" has become a topic of conversation from California to Maine, and from the cocktail party to the church.

Despite this unprecedented interest, however, I think it is a rare instance when corporate business takes the initiative, at a loss in profits, to insure the safety of America's youth.

I was, therefore, pleased to read a recent account of the efforts of the Testor Corp., of Rockford, Ill., the largest manu-

facturer of plastic cement, in promoting these goals, by reducing the dangerous possibilities of "glue sniffing."

I commend Mr. Charles D. Miller, president of Testor, and Mr. Gerald Wexler, chairman of the Jupiter Corp., for their fine contribution, and I ask unanimous consent that a press account of their activities be printed in the RECORD.

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

GLUE SNIFFERS BEWARE

(By Edwin Darby)

"You can be sure it's the model—not the kid—that's gonna fly. Because . . . you can't sniff Testor's, there's something in it."

That's the beginning of an advertisement in September issues of hobby trade magazines by the Testor Corp. of Rockford, Ill., the leading manufacturer of plastic cement for model building.

When glue-sniffing first began to hit the front pages, Testor stopped advertising its cement. The September ads are the first the company has run to promote the Testor brand in five years.

Charles D. Miller, president of Testor, feels so strongly on the subject that this was not the only decision he made that could and did affect the company's sales and profits. The decisions were made with the approval of Gerold Wexler, chairman of the Jupiter Corp., the parent company of Testor.

The story goes back to 1962. Miller was one of the leaders in the industry who proposed Hobby Industry Association sponsor research to find an additive that would make it impossible for kids to sniff glue. A $50,000 grant was given to an independent research laboratory.

The lab produced a fat report and a list of 94 chemicals that possibly might do the job. In its own lab, Testor went to work on the list. "There were many problems," says Miller. "The substance had to be obnoxious to the sniffer but not noticeable to the hobbyist. It also had to be something that the sniffer couldn't get use to, yet it had to be something that would not cause permanent harm."

In Item No. 34 ("Thank the Lord it wasn't 94"), the Testor chemists found what they were looking for. The chemical name is allylisothiocyanate. A common name is oil of mustard. "It is really a synthetic horseradish," Miller says. "It is used as an additive to horse-radish and hot mustard, so we knew it was safe."

Added to Testor cement, it had no odor, but gave a sniffer a jolt like the hottest of hot mustard, inflaming the nose and eyes. (Morton International, the salt and foods company, was "very helpful" to Testor and is the company's supplier now of the oil.)

In January, 1968, Testor was ready to start marketing the product on a test basis. Southern California was picked as the test market.

Almost immediately, Miller started hearing from his dealers: "The kids were coming in and asking for anything but Testor's."

The dealers—hobby shops, department stores, variety chains—were mystified. Necessarily, Testor had sent out the new, anti-sniffing product without any notice. The idea was to find out if oil of mustard would work.

The same thinking governed national introduction of the new formula. There was no sense in tipping off the kids and starting a run on kicky old-stuff still in the store. This summer with the old inventory cleaned out and the new cements in the stores, Testor did notify all dealers.

"We did suffer a definite slump in sales," Miller says. "The dealers didn't know why the kids were turning down Testor's. But by the end of the year we think sales will be higher than they ever were.

"Actually, sales to glue-sniffers were always a small percentage of the total, but now the store has a way of identifying the sniffer. What this will get at is the hole-in-the-wall store that sells a half dozen tubes at a price in a brown paper bag."

Testor has now made the mustard oil formula available to all of its competitors. There are seven manufactuers of any significance, Miller says, and six already have adopted the formula, with the seventh now making evaluation tests.

But the problem is much larger, according to Miller. The public outcry and the efforts of many governing bodies have been aimed at glue.

Nevertheless, any number of readily available products, those containing chemical solvents that evaporate rapidly, give the same sort of "high" as glue. Miller thinks it is time manufacturers of other products look at what might happen once glue-sniffing produces nothing but tears.

To that end he has made all of Testor's research and development work available to any manufacturer using solvents in retail products. As the new Testor ads tell dealers, sell the new formula with "confidence that you're promoting the right way for a kid to get off the ground."

WYOMING'S FAVORABLE BUSINESS CLIMATE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the first great explorers of the New World found our country the land of opportunity and beauty with a vast wealth of natural resources.

Businesses moving to Wyoming for the first time note that those same qualities remain in our State, even today. Wyoming is a new State in terms of development, and because of safeguards we have established to protect her natural beauty, Wyoming will never become a State that is overdeveloped. Wyoming is an excellent place to live and a wonderful place to raise a family—breathing pure air, fishing in clear streams, and hunting in virtually untouched forests.

The firm of Church & Dwight on September 5, 1969, dedicated its new Arm & Hammer product plant located in Wyoming's Sweetwater County.

The Green River, Wyo., Star of September 11, 1969, reported on the dedication ceremonies. 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:

FAVORABLE BUSINESS ATMOSPHERE IS INCENTIVE TO NEW INDUSTRIES IN STATE

The favorable business atmosphere created by the Wyoming and county governments, and the people of the area, added to the natural attraction of trona in bringing Church & Dwight to Green River for its first new plant since the 1890's, and to move outside of New York for the first time. This, Dwight Minton, president of the company, told Governor Hathaway and the guests at the ceremonies dedicating the Arm & Hammer product plant of C&D west of Green River, and at a banquet for employees and civic and political figures Friday.

Minton heard the Governor state that 1968 was the largest growth year in recent Wyoming history—and that the state had experienced an economic gain of 20% in the last year, citing the great oil development in the Gillette area and the growth in Sweetwater county as basic reasons.

Hathaway said that Church & Dwight is an example of the kind of industry Wyoming needs to bring to the state, as it is the first to utilize products of Wyoming industry as the basis for another consumer product. He emphasized that such firms as C&D can bring to Wyoming the opportunity for quality growth.

In the dedication and placque unveiling at the plant, County Commission Chairman John Yerkovich extended a welcome to C&D on behalf of the county—that evening at the banquet Mayor R. D. Schuck did the honors on behalf of Green River.

The dedicatory placque was unveiled jointly Friday afternoon by Gov. Hathaway and Pres. Minton.

Introduced at the Friday ceremonies were also Robert Sampson, vice president, manufacture, C&D, and Joseph Heard, designer of the Green River plant.

Saturday morning, area leaders were guests of Union Pacific at the Mustang in honor of the C&D officials. Resident Manager Wayne Mortensen was master of ceremonies at the Friday events Ed Sencabaugh of UPRR, at the Saturday affair.

REPRESENTATIVE BRADEMAS LAUDS STATE ARTS COUNCILS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, On September 17, 1969, Representative JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana, delivered the keynote address to the Federal-State Conference on the Arts, conducted by the National Endowment for the Arts, here in Washington.

Attending this conference were the chairmen and executive directors of the arts councils from all sections of the country. It was also my pleasure to take part in the conference.

Representative BRADEMAS is chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, the subcommittee having jurisdiction over legislation authorizing the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, and I have worked very closely with him on this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of Representative BRADEMAS' fine address on this occasion.

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

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JOHN BRADEMAS

I am much honored by the invitation to open this 1969 Federal-State Conference on the Arts.

More than most peoples of the world, we Americans are given to self-analysis and the taking of our national pulse. Yet we are today caught up in more somber searching of our souls and questioning of our purposes than is even our customary disposition.

I cite but a few instances, beginning with Vietnam.

Although we must hope that President Nixon's Tuesday announcement of further troop withdrawals will bring progress in the search for peace, we can be sure that the debate over the war and its further conduct will continue.

Vietnam in turn has spawned a re-examination of America's role in the world and of our commitments abroad.

Senators and Congressmen are for the first time in years carefully scrutinizing our military expenditures and asking whether they are not out of proportion with these commitments.

College students, blacks, religious leaders and others are raising profound questions about America's direction and insisting that the nation make real the ideals we profess.

A TURNING INWARD

All of us here could recite other developments which, taken together, have caused our people and their elected Representatives in Congress to turn inward . . . to reevaluate the conditions and quality of life in our own society.

This is, however, no return to isolationism. Rather, in the phrase that has now become a cliche but is true nonetheless, we are engaged in the process of reordering our priorities.

A case in point: only a few weeks ago, in a move unprecedented in my time in Congress, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly rejected the recommendations of both its Appropriations Committee and the Administration by voting, on the floor of the House, to add to an appropriations bill over $1 billion for, of all things, education.

A majority of both Democrats and Republicans in the House were in effect insisting that, severe as the fiscal crunch may be, education must not be the place to scrimp.

I hope very much that this turning inward, this new sensitivity to the conditions and quality of our national life will embrace both an enhanced awareness of the importance of the arts in America and the need to give them greater public support. More specifically, and speaking as a legislator and Chairman of the House Subcommittee with jurisdiction over the National Arts and Humanities Foundation, I hope that we shall soon see more Federal support for the programs administered by the National Endowment for the Arts.

Let me here make clear my deep disagreement with those who contend that the arts are a frill and a luxury and that we cannot afford to support them until the Vietnam war is over.

On the contrary, I strongly agree with the view of W. McNeil Lowry of the Ford Foundation in his recent report on the economic crisis in the arts. Remarking on the meager funding of the Arts and Humanities programs, Mr. Lowry observed:

"Pressures of war and other crises have been freely cited in explanation of this action, but there is no reason to believe that any significant Federal program in the arts can be effectively argued whether in Congress or in the public if its justification must be that all other great national questions are in equilibrium. Other governments—democratic, socialist, or oligarchic—have proceeded without such a justification . . .

"The arts [should] not always depend upon a contest over priorities. . . . There will not exist an effective public policy for the arts until they are treated as important in their own right."

This is the point—that the arts, like education, must come to be regarded as "important in their own right."

And with such an understanding there will become possible "an effective public policy for the arts."

PRESIDENT NIXON'S APPOINTMENT OF NANCY HANKS A GOOD OMEN

In this respect, I believe that President Nixon's appointment this month of Miss Nancy Hanks to be Chairman of the National Council for the Arts is a good omen, for both the appointment and the President's comments in announcing it reflects awareness at the highest levels of government of the indispensable place of the arts in the spectrum of our public concerns.

As Executive Secretary of the Special Studies Project of the Rockefeller Brothers Foundation and later as President of the Associated Councils of the Arts, Nancy Hanks has won the respect of legislators and artists alike with her intelligence and imagination. And may I interject that in this town she will need plenty of both!

In her new responsibility, Nancy will be replacing one of the most respected and gifted champions of the arts in our country—Roger L. Stevens.

Now here beginneth the reading of the First Lesson—by President Nixon, in appointing Miss Hanks. He said: "One of the important goals in my administration is the further advance in the cultural development of our nation . . .

"The Federal government has a vital role as catalyst, innovator, and supporter of public and private efforts for cultural development . . . I shall hope to give leadership to this effort and urge the Congress to do the same."

The Second Lesson—if I may pursue my ecclesiastical metaphor—will be read by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and let us hope that, in recommending money for the Arts Endowment, he matches the President's faith with works—i.e. dollars.

OUTSTANDING RECORD OF NATIONAL ARTS ENDOWMENT

For I believe that the record of the National Arts Endowment, though brief in years, amply justifies substantially increasing our public investment in the arts.

Let us not forget that it was just five years ago this month that President Johnson signed the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964, establishing the National Council on the Arts. September, 1969 marks as well the fourth anniversary of the signing into law of the bill creating the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, which provided for the establishment of the National Endowment for the Arts, the funding arm of the Council.

In my view, you and your colleagues across the land who have administered programs in part made possible through the Arts Endowment can take pride in the remarkable achievements so far, remarkable in variety, quality and number of people reached.

As a direct result of the National Arts Endowment, the American Film Institute now exists.

The American National Theatre and Academy building in New York City, donated to the Endowment, is a resource for performing groups all over the country.

The first major national artists housing center in the U.S. will, as a result of Endowment initiative, open this year on New York's Lower West Side.

The National Arts Endowment has also supplied funds to regional theatres so that dramas of quality can flourish many miles off Broadway. The Tyrone Guthrie Theatre in Minneapolis, the American Conservatory Theatre in San Francisco, and the Arena Stage here in Washington have all received needed sustenance from the Endowment.

INDIVIDUAL GRANTS PROGRAM DESERVES SUPPORT

The Laboratory Theatre project in Providence, Los Angeles, and New Orleans and the Artists in Residency programs, beneficiaries all of Federal Arts funds, have brought direct experience of the drama to thousands of school and university students.

Individual artists as well as institutions have received support from the Arts Endowment. Although less than 5% of the Endowment budget is expended on individual grant programs, I believe this investment to be eminently wise

Twenty-one writers received $7,000 each in fiscal 1968 to enable them to complete works in progress or conduct research essential to their work

Individual grants of $2,000 each were made to assist twenty-nine gifted but unrecognized writers.

And individual awards of $5,000 each were given to twenty-nine painters and sculptors in recognition of past accomplishments and to encourage further efforts in the visual arts.

I trust the individual grants program will continue—and I strongly support it.

All these and many more activities testify to the success of the Endowment in its first few years. Its programs have helped extend the arts throughout the land—from inner city ghettoes to small rural communities—in the theatre, dance, opera, painting, music, films and writing.

GROWTH OF STATE ARTS COUNCILS PHENOMENAL

Particularly significant, I think, is that the Endowment's efforts have stimulated important new sources of support for the arts.

In this respect, clearly one of the most gratifying results of the law creating the National Endowment has been the growth of the State Arts Councils, which you represent.

As you know, the Arts Councils were authorized under Section 5(H) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965.

Let me here note what I can only describe as the phenomenal progress of the State Arts Council movement since that time.

In Fiscal 1966—when the appropriations bill contained no funds under section 5(H)—only 22 States provided funds of any kind for their Arts Councils.

In Fiscal Year 1967, when 5(H) funds went to each State, the number of Councils rose to 35. In both 1968 and 1969, 42 councils received appropriations from state budgets, and this fiscal year (1970), 44.

Far more impressive, however, than the number of states providing funds for Arts Councils work, are the total amounts for each succeeding year since 1966.

That first year the total was only slightly more than $3 million. In fiscal year 1967, when the first funds were made available to the states under section 5(H), the figure jumped to nearly $5 million.

This year nearly seven and one half million dollars in state funds will be earmarked for the Arts Councils.

This means, essentially, that the $2 million contained in the appropriations bill passed by the House this summer will be matched three and one-half times over in *state revenues alone!*

If we add to this amount the matching program funds or services from local communities and organizations, we can see that the Federal government is receiving an approximate return of 450 percent on its direct investment in the arts through State Arts Councils.

I know no other Federal seed money programs with so effective a record in generating greater support from outside sources.

HEARINGS IN CONGRESS ON ARTS PROGRAMS

I have so far been engaging in remembrances of things past. Where, you may ask, are we going now?

As you know, the bill authorizing the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities expires next June. The Select Subcommittee on Education, which I have the honor to Chair, will hold hearings sometime during the next few months on legislation to continue the life of the Endowment and to fix the level of authorized funding.

And may I here say how anxious my Subcommittee and I are to hear from you, the leaders of the States Arts Councils across the country, to have your views and your suggestions for improving the programs of the Endowment. As they say in the country music shows, Keep them cards and letters comin' in!

I suggest to you that money rather than existence must now be the primary concern of supporters of the Arts Endowment. For most Congressmen of both parties have come to accept as both appropriate and desirable a role for the Federal government in the arts.

Indeed, a spokesman from so conservative a community as Indianapolis in my own state, Izler Solomon, Music Director of the Indianapolis Symphony, wrote only last Sunday in the New York Times that "The solution [in this case, to financing music] will have to be found in joint funding by schools, park departments, foundations, industry,

cities, states and, most important, Federal aid."

". . . Certainly nobody belongs on a symphony board", said Mr. Solomon in a pronouncement which ten years ago would have been heresy in the Hoosier heartland, "who thinks 'Federal aid' are dirty words."

So the question now is not *whether* the Arts Endowment should be, but rather *what* it should be doing and *how much money* it should have to do its job.

Up to now the Endowment has spent—I prefer the verb, "invested"—some $22.9 million. Last year's budget was about $8.5 million.

I know that Nancy Hanks is already hard at work preparing her recommendations for the new Arts Endowment budget.

And as I have already said, the most important matching program she will have to deal with this year is President Nixon's statement on the arts with his budget request for them.

Certainly the case is compelling for substantially more funds for the arts. Meagerly financed as they are, the programs of the Endowment have elicited nationwide praise.

SOME PROVISIONS OF HOUSE TAX REFORM BILL THREATEN ARTS

Moreover as the Baumal-Bowen study and other surveys have warned, the economic plight of the performing arts in America has now become alarming.

Nor has the prospect of changes in Federal tax laws brightened the outlook. Although I am a militant advocate of plugging loopholes and bringing equity to our Federal tax structure, I am distressed that the tax reform bill passed recently by the House would impose an across-the-board 7.5% levy on the investment income of foundations. The arts rely heavily on foundations in many ways, and to punish all foundations for the sins of a few seems to me unwise public policy.

I hope as well that the Senate Finance Committee will not allow to stand that feature of the House bill which provides that a donation of a work of art must, for tax deduction purposes, be valued either at the cost the donor originally paid or, if valued at its appreciated figure, be subject to capital gains tax. This unrealistic formula will obviously enormously inhibit donations of art to the many museums which depend heavily on private gifts.

Aside from such financial problems as these, which afflict the arts generally, there are certain other questions about future Federal arts policy worth reviewing.

For example, some have suggested that all Federal funds for the arts should henceforth go only to State Arts Councils rather than for developing national programs in the arts.

NEED FOR CONTINUING NATIONAL PROGRAMS IN THE ARTS

I believe, however, and I understand most of you do too, that there is a continuing and powerful need for programs in the arts that go beyond the borders of a single state.

Let me cite an example or two of the importance of continuing a national arts program.

In 1966, when the American Ballet Theatre, for years among the most imaginative companies in the world, was in financial trouble, the National Endowment for the Arts was able to make it an emergency grant of $100,000 which was matched with private funds. This seed money represented a recognition that the company was a national resource and made it possible for the Ballet Theatre to secure further commitments from foundations and other private resources.

Or I could remind you how the Endowment helped the San Francisco Opera in the creation of the Western Opera Theatre, a small, flexible ensemble company which can perform in communities whose facilities will not permit appearance of opera on a large scale. In three years, it has increased its performance rate from 35 to 150 per season, reaching communities in which opera had never before been performed.

MUST STRENGTHEN STATE ARTS COUNCILS

My view, therefore, is that the wisest policy for us to pursue is that of greater financial support both for the general programs of the National Endowment under Section 5 (C) of the Act and for increased funding for the State Arts Councils under 5 (H).

We need both, and we need to build upon the splendid patterns of cooperation which have been developed between the National Endowment and the states. The state and national programs complement and reinforce each other.

Let me make clear, however, that I believe the State Arts Councils are capable of handling substantially increased funds and that I specifically endorse raising from $50,000 to $100,000, the authorization for each State Council.

AREAS THAT NEED REINFORCEMENT

Beyond strengthening the hand of the State Councils, there are, I think, certain existing areas that require reinforcement. In testimony before the House Education and Labor Committee, Roger L. Stevens touched on several of them:

The poetry in the schools program, which enables established poets to visit high schools;

The burgeoning needs of symphony orchestras and operas—a problem so pressing that it may well require special attention;

Arts programs in the inner city—an activity yearning for expansion beyond such Endowment-backed efforts as a school for the arts in Harlem, another at Hull House in Chicago and the Watts Workshop in Los Angeles.

The National Endowment also needs money for research into the strengths and weaknesses of formal art education in our elementary schools, often a child's first encounter with the arts. And how good is the teaching of the arts in our colleges and universities?

Nor should the implications for arts programs for older Americans be neglected; the time of retirement can for many be a time of enrichment through the arts.

We should experiment, too, with utilizing radio, television and films to bring to as many Americans as possible, especially those who live in inaccessible areas, an opportunity to experience plays, music and exhibitions of art.

All of you here could, I am sure, add to this list your own suggestions. I have sought only to limit the horizon of possibilities for the arts in America and to suggest the contribution which the Federal government can make to their support.

The kinds of questions I have here discussed with you are the kinds of proposals for Federal support of the arts that, I believe, should be given careful consideration by Congress and the Administration, and these and questions like them will be raised in our Subcommittee hearings.

SUPPORT FOR ARTS IN CONGRESS LARGELY DEPENDS ON YOU

Let me say, however, in closing that our capacity in Congress to provide support for the arts depends ultimately on the support that people like you can generate and stimulate across the country.

You have vigorous allies on Capitol Hill—men and women like Congressmen Frank Thompson, Jr. of New Jersey, William Moorhead of Pennsylvania, Julia Hansen of Washington, Ogden Reid of New York, Ben Reifel of South Dakota and Wiley Mayne of Iowa, and in the Senate, such articulate champions as Senators Mansfield, Fulbright, Pell, Javits and Percy.

Support of the arts is clearly a bipartisan enterprise!

But your friends in Congress can be no more effective in advocating your cause than you enable us to be.

You must, therefore, in your own states and communities, communicate your concern about the need for adequate Federal support for the arts to your own Senators and Representatives.

I have said that we live in a time of national introspection and self-examination. In such a time we need all the more, if we are to make our country what it ought to be, a land where individual men and women can live lives of joy and beauty as well as of hope and freedom, generously to support those activities that make such lives possible.

And among such activities surely are the arts of America and the qualities of mind and spirit and imagination of which they are the incarnations.

ALPHA CHI FEDERATED WOMEN'S CLUB OF DAYTON, TEX., ENDORSES 100,000-ACRE BIG THICKET NATIONAL PARK IN SOUTHEAST TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Alpha Chi Federated Women's Club of Dayton, Tex., adopted on July 16, 1969, a resolution urging the establishment of a 100,000-acre Big Thicket National Park. The members of this fine organization recognize the great value of beautiful wilderness in southeast Texas, and the necessity for preserving it for the use and enjoyment of the future generations.

This unique area is truly a botanical wonderland. In the Big Thicket are found the world's largest eastern red cedar, black hickory, holly, planertree, red bay, yaupon, sparkleberry, common sweetleaf, and silverbell.

In addition to the Big Thicket's rich and diverse plant life, the area is also the home of the many rare birds, such as the red-cockaded woodpecker, Bachman's sparrow, and the all but extinct whooping crane. The Big Thicket is probably the last refuge of the rarest of woodpeckers, the great Ivory Billed.

This great wilderness is vanishing rapidly. We must act now to save it.

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

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

JULY 16, 1969.

Whereas, the Big Thicket of Texas is a meeting place for eastern, western, and northern ecological elements; and

Whereas, this is the last stand in Texas of the nearly extinct Ivory-billed Woodpecker; and

Whereas, this beautiful and unique area is rapidly being destroyed by bulldozer and chain saw; therefore

Be it resolved that Alpha Chi Federated Women's Club of Dayton, Texas urges the preservation of at least 100,000 acres containing the most unique areas of the Big Thicket, these areas to be connected by environmental corridors; and

Be It Further Resolved that the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate of the United States be requested to set immediate hearings on S. 4 which would create a Big Thicket National Area.

MRS. TOMMY WHITE,
President, Alpha Chi.

THE PESTICIDE PERIL—LII

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, a worldwide controversy is being actively debated about the threat to our environment from the unnecessary and careless use of chemicals to control pests.

Alarming evidence has been presented which unquestionably credits persistent, toxic pesticides with the death and near extinction of many wildlife species and suggests links to cancer and stomach and liver ailments in man. Some foreign countries have placed bans on the use of DDT and related pesticides. In the United States two States have already banned DDT and many others are considering similar proposals. Gardening publications are advising their readers not to use these pesticides, and conservation groups are warning their members about the dangers.

In the midst of this concerned campaign, Dr. Arthur D. Hasler, professor of limnology at the University of Wisconsin, wrote to the Milwaukee Journal deploring a quote he recently read in that paper by a U.S. Department of Agriculture spokesman recommending herbicides for killing aquatic plants in Florida. Dr. Hasler strongly suspects some good use could be found for these aquatic plants, making their destruction unwise:

Aquatic plants in our lakes as well as fish should be viewed as a harvestable crop and therefore equipment now procurable should be employed to remove and utilize them. Moreover, new effort should be expended to develop better harvesting equipment. In addition investigations should be strengthened to search for new utilizable products. We should be impoverishing our overfertilized lakes by harvesting crops, not refertilizing them by chemical control methods which also interrupt many normal events in the life of hundreds of algae, invertebrate and vertebrate animals.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Hasler's letter to the Milwaukee Journal be printed in the RECORD.

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

WATER WEEDS AND CHEMICALS

(By Arthur D. Hasler)

To The Journal: On your Editorial Page for June 19, a National Geographic society bulletin quoted Dr. Lyle W. Weldon, United States department of agriculture, aquatic weed laboratory, Fort Lauderdale, Fla., as stating that "one acre of water hyacinths creates as much pollution as 40 people dumping raw sewage." Also that "aquatic weeds alone in Florida cost the state more than $50 million a year just in property depreciation."

Herbicides (plant poisons) are recommended for killing the aquatic plants. In this recommendation there is a misplaced application of agricultural procedure which is to eradicate, by poisonous chemicals, all species on a plot of land which compete with a single species of food plant.

Chemical poisons applied to lakes, canals or rivers, however, cannot be restricted as they can be in a farm plot because in an aquatic system they are circulated by currents throughout the diverse and complex communities of plants and animals. While the presumed design in this control measure is to kill only one species of aquatic plant, the poison in fact affects hundreds of species of organisms, including the eggs and larvae of fish, too often adversely.

Every landscape produces a potentially usable crop of living things. In a world in need of food and fertilizers it is incongruous that a crop of this magnitude should be destroyed. A more logical practice would be to harvest and utilize the surpluses of nature, not to poison them. Harvesting of water hyacinths could yield a product. When poisoned their rotting bodies pollute and fertilize the water. Moreover, as the poison is decomposed into its chief degradation product—carbon dioxide—it also serves as a fertilizer. Hence, chemical control of aquatic plants pollutes twice. Furthermore, if the poison is a persistent pesticide it is even more inappropriate as a solution to this problem.

A species of large aquatic plant (phragmites) which thrives on the Danube river delta produces a profitable paper product for the Rumanians. A search for useful products of other types in aquatic plants will yield commodities of economic value and therefore alleviate suffering in many parts of the world where plants now choke eutrophic bodies of water.

In the meantime harvesting these plants and using them for animal feed or compost fertilizer on the land is a far more rational use and conforms to higher ecological ethics than does poisoning them to rot in the waters and to refertilize the habitat for more to flourish.

These same arguments apply to Wisconsin. Aquatic plants in our lakes as well as fish should be viewed as a harvestable crop and therefore equipment now procurable should be employed to remove and utilize them. Moreover, new effort should be expended to develop better harvesting equipment. In addition investigations should be strengthened to search for new utilizable products. We should be impoverishing our overfertilized lakes by harvesting crops, not refertilizing them by chemical control methods which also interrupt many normal events in the life of hundreds of algae, invertebrate and vertebrate animals.

ARTHUR D. HASLER.

INCOME AND ASSETS OF SENATOR AND MRS. CHURCH

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on September 12 I issued another in my series of voluntary disclosures of income and assets covering myself and my wife. At that time, I failed to include, through oversight, a bit of subsidiary information pertinent to the disclosure.

As I have stated in my earlier disclosures, my wife has certain real property holdings in Idaho, which I think should be listed. She is the owner of the family residence at 109 West Idaho Street in Boise, and she holds an undivided half interest in the Robinson Bar Ranch near Clayton. She earns no net income, derives no profit, from either property. For my part, I now share with my brother, Col. Richard B. Church, a future interest in two properties conveyed to us by our mother, who withheld a life estate. At one of them, located at 816 Pueblo Street in Boise, she at present resides; the other is an apartment house our father built at 415 Jefferson Street. For the rest of my mother's life, of course, the full use and benefit of these two properties are exclusively hers to enjoy.

FOLKLORE FORUM ENDORSES S. 1591

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have long been concerned about the disappearance of the Nation's folk traditions. We are widely varied people and thus are the heirs to a rich folk tradition. We owe it to our posterity to record and preserve this tradition so that it can be passed on.

In March of this year, I introduced S. 1591, a bill to create an American Folklife Foundation. This proposal has now received the support of many of America's leading folk culturists. One such endorsement comes from the editors of Folklore Forum published by the Folklore Institute at Indiana University in Bloomington, Ind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter of endorsement be printed in the RECORD.

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

FOLKLORE FORUM,
Bloomington, Ind., April 12, 1969.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: The Editors of the *Folklore Forum* would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your introduction of Senate Bill S. 1591, which aims at the establishment of an American Folklife Foundation. This bill is an excellent one and we fully support its aims. We intend to publish an editorial urging our readers all over the country to support your efforts on behalf of the study of our great American folk culture. We certainly hope that this bill will be passed out of committee.

It is certainly encouraging to realize that our National leaders are aware of the wealth of traditions which we as a nation possess and that these traditions should be studied and preserved. We are sure that such a Foundation will be well received by all Americans who are interested in their own heritage.

Yours sincerely,

ELLIOTT ORING,
JAMES R. DURHAM,
F. A. DE CARO,
Editors.

MINNESOTA GRANTS FOR THE UNITED NEGRO COLLEGE FUND

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on June 25 of this year, the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. and the Hill Family Foundation, of St. Paul, Minn., presented grants totaling more then $700,000 to the 36 member institutions of the United Negro College Fund and two other predominantly Negro colleges for microfilm research centers and microfilmed materials on Afro-American culture and history. These grants show the importance that corporations and foundations are placing in the continuing expansion of education at the highest level to all segments of our society.

Mr. Ray H. Herzog, vice president of the 3M Company's Graphic Systems Group, stated the case appropriately in saying:

We feel that industry in the United States cannot afford to wait for sufficiently educated black executive talent. These colleges will shoulder some of the most significant educational responsibilities of our Nation during the next decade. It will be their responsibility to provide leadership in this area.

Equality is based squarely on the quality of education, and with new opportunities opening to black students, they need more than ever the quality training that prepares them to be com-

petitive. This month approximately 45,000 students will be enrolled in the UNCF's 36 member institutions. More than 20 percent of these young people come from States outside of the South. Of the nearly 300,000 black students enrolled in all American colleges and universities, UNCF schools are training one-fifth. Graduates of UNCF colleges represent 85 percent of the Negro physicians in the United States, three-fourths of the Negroes who hold Ph. D.'s and innumerable religious, community, and political leaders, teachers, and social workers.

The black student of yesterday was training mainly for teaching and social working positions. The black student of today has the opportunity to train for business and industry as well as the professions. The pressure is intense at both ends—the Negro must have a quality education at the highest level, and the companies must recruit and hire quality black executives and professionals. UNCF colleges are actively expanding and initiating new programs, courses, and departments to meet the need of todays business and industry. Job opportunities have greatly increased over the last 5 years, and in 1968 alone there was a 65-percent increase in the number of UNCF students interviewed by business and industry over 1967, with an increase of 100 percent in the number of job offers.

Thousands of black youngsters go through high school with low motivation because they have no realistic hope of going to college. The fund's 36 schools, throughout its 25-year history, have given hope to these many young people of high potential but limited preparation.

The 3M Company, long active in providing educational grants, aid and scholarship programs, has taken another important step forward in granting more than $500,000 in these micro-film research centers to the United Negro College Fund. The Hill Family Foundation in granting more than $200,000 for workshops for librarians and instructors who will utilize these materials, continues to support the development of education, research, and new fields of study.

As a U.S. Senator and as a private citizen, I am equally concerned about the educational facilities in our country and the great necessity for quality education for all. As a Minnesotan, I am proud that the 3M Company and the Hill Family Foundation have expressed their will to share in the educational advancements in our country by providing these grants to the United Negro College Fund.

GARBAGE CRISIS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, Government officials have indicated the severity of the problem of disposing of our waste by calling it "a national disgrace." The per capita waste collection is now over 5 pounds a day, and by 1980 it will be 8 pounds daily.

An article published in the U.S. News & World Report of September 8, 1969, outlines some of the problems involved and some ways this problem is being met. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Why the U.S. Is in Danger of Being Engulfed by Its Trash," be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHY THE U.S. IS IN DANGER OF BEING ENGULFED BY ITS TRASH

Americans, their health threatened by air and water pollution, are disturbed by warnings that they also face the danger of being engulfed in trash.

Mountains of waste are building up around the major cities. Space for disposal is running out. Garbage-dumping is poisoning water supplies. Inefficient incineration further fouls the air.

The problem is not just household and commercial waste. Worn-out automobiles and tires are dumped by the millions. Bottles, cans and paper containers litter streets, highways, rural roads and parks. Industrial and farm refuse piles higher and higher.

The country now has to deal with 3.5 billion tons of solid waste each year, and that figure keeps growing. This includes 360 million tons of household and commercial trash.

It costs cities 4.5 billions a year to collect and dispose of this refuse.

Government experts say the situation is nearing "a national disgrace." They warn that new, imaginative solutions must be found. Some experiments backed by federal funds, are under way to find the most efficient ways of getting rid of trash.

Richard D. Vaughan, director of the Bureau of Solid Waste Management of the U.S. Public Health Service, notes:

"The most convenient means for disposal—usually an open-burning dump—was, and unfortunately still is, most frequently employed. However, it is becoming increasingly obvious that such a casual approach to solid-waste management—which may have been acceptable in an earlier day—can no longer be tolerated in a country of over 200 million persons, 70 per cent of whom live in urban areas."

It is not possible any more, says a special report of the National Academy of Sciences, just to throw garbage "away."

"As the earth becomes more crowded," the Academy said, "there is no longer an 'away.' One person's trash basket is another's living space."

NOW: 5.3 POUNDS EACH

According to Mr. Vaughan, in 1920 an average of 2.75 pounds of waste was collected daily from each person in the U.S. Today, this figure has grown to 5.3 pounds, and it is estimated that by 1980, the per capita waste collection will be 8 pounds a day.

From New York to San Francisco, cities are running out of disposal space. One year's rubbish from 10,000 people covers an acre of ground 7 feet deep.

Incineration is not the final solution because burning leaves a 20 per cent residue of ash, in addition to pollution of the air. New high-temperature furnaces, however, may reduce the ash content to 10 per cent.

Some big cities, notably San Francisco and Philadelphia, have been dickering with railroad lines to freight their trash many miles away to otherwise useless land or abandoned mines, but costs and other problems have delayed these programs.

Another idea being considered is compressing rubbish in containers, taking it out to sea and jettisoning it in deep water. This method presumably would benefit only seaboard cities.

FROM DUMP TO PARK

The major innovation in waste disposal so far has been development of the "sanitary land-fill" system. Trash is hauled to an open area and put into trenches. Then it is covered with soil. When filled, the dump is converted into a park or recreational facility.

This is being done at a site in Washington, D.C., where open burning was practiced a few miles from the Capitol. A few months hence, dumping will stop and conversion of the area into a 300-acre park will begin.

The sanitary-landfill system, says the Public Health Service, makes a dump rodent-proof and odorless. It is only slightly more costly than burning.

Why is trash becoming such a big problem? The answer, in part, is the steady introduction of more conveniently packaged consumer items. Increasingly, too, many items still reach the buyer in containers that do not deteriorate quickly or at all.

It has been estimated that Americans, in a typical year, throw away 48 billion cans, 26 billion bottles, more than 30 million tons of paper, 4 million tons of plastics, and 100 million rubber tires weighing a million tons.

Use of disposable bottles, to be tossed away rather than returned for a refund, is spreading. Aluminum cans, which unlike steel cans do not rust away when discarded, are growing in popularity. More and more items come in plastics which do not decompose and cause noxious fumes when burned.

A recent survey of litter along a one-mile stretch of two-lane Kansas highway turned up these items: 770 paper cups, 730 empty cigarette packs, 590 beer cans, 130 soft-drink bottles, 120 beer bottles 110 whisky bottles and 90 beer cartons.

The collection also included everything from bedsprings to shoes.

One firm, the Reynolds Metal Company, is trying to make a small dent in all this litter. It is offering a half-cent bounty for each aluminum beer can turned in at depots in Los Angeles and Miami, Fla.

Mr. Vaughan gave a viewpoint of the Bureau of Solid Waste Management when he said:

"I sometimes don't understand Americans. In Europe, you almost never see anyone discard anything in the street. In the United States, I've seen Don't Litter signs practically covered with litter. Americans are litterers. The problem is so bad that we have sociologists working on the problem, trying to find out why Americans have such an untidy streak."

DEAD-TRAFFIC JAM

Another headache for the officials dealing with solid waste is the increasing number of scrapped autos. One estimate is that, by 1980, Americans will be discarding 10 million motor vehicles a year.

With the introduction in recent years of new methods of steelmaking, there is almost no demand for baled steel scrap.

Under the old method, cars were put into a hydraulic press, squeezed into blocks about the size of a small trunk and fed to steel-plant furnaces.

Now some old cars are being chewed up by huge machines that turn them into shavings and chunks for reprocessing into steel. But one of these machines—and there are only a few in the country—can dispose of only about 1,000 car shells a day, after these have been stripped of tires, seats, engines, windows and transmissions.

As for the 100 million worn-out tires that are thrown away every year, experts are seeking ways to make them into something more useful than bumpers on boatyard docks.

Scientists of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Company and the U.S. Bureau of Mines, using a "closed reactor" similar to a cooking oven, have extracted chemicals, gas and tar from the discarded casings. The new process may help in solving one waste-disposal problem while also reclaiming useful materials.

NEW GOLD RUSH?

Another Bureau of Mines project has literally found gold in rubbish piles. A study of ash residue in incinerators turned up both

gold and silver from lost or castoff costume jewelry, coins, and photographic negatives. The minerals were discovered to assay at $14 per ton of ash.

Although the trash problem primarily is a local one, the Government has stepped in to lend assistance. Under a 1965 act of Congress, the Bureau of Solid Waste Management was created. Two thirds of its budget of 15 million dollars goes in grants to State and local agencies, universities and a few private companies for experiments to find better ways of handling trash.

One research project at the University of Pennsylvania is examining the possibility of using pipeline techniques for collection and removal of household solid waste. Researchers have designed a pilot-scale removal system that would pipe away solid wastes that had been mixed with water.

"Recycling and reuse" is another concept that is being investigated. A limiting factor in this process at present is that it must start with hand separation of different types of trash. The Stanford Research Institute, under a Government grant, is working to develop a separator that would use air pressure to sort out five different types of materials, some of which could be processed for reuse.

JOBS FOR HOUSEWIVES?

Mr. Vaughan believes that, in 10 to 15 years, all but 5 to 10 per cent of household garbage will be reclaimed.

"It would be nice," he says, "if the American housewife could be persuaded to sort out garbage into about 15 different piles. Then all the plastic bottles and aluminum cans could be gathered and melted down for reuse. Well, my wife isn't about to take on such a job of garbage-sorting, and I doubt that many other wives would."

The answer, he believes, lies in automation of the kind being researched at Stanford. Success in that field would make it economic to reclaim not only plastics and metals but also food scraps from which fertilizer could be made.

Composting of household and restaurant garbage on a commercial scale for sale as fertilizer has been tried, but has not been notably successful. Farmers and gardeners find it easier to pick up a bag of chemical fertilizer at the local hardware store, and most of the compost firms have closed.

The dream of most experts in the solid-waste-disposal field is a concept called "total recycling." This would eliminate trash because nothing would ever be thrown away. It would be used again in some way.

An automobile, for example, would be designed and built so its unworn parts could be retrieved for reuse when its usefulness was ended. Only irreducible scrap would remain, and that could be salvaged. But the experts agree that the time when such a system may evolve is not now in sight.

What Mr. Vaughn calls "one of the most promising engineering concepts in solid-waste management" is a combustion power unit being developed under contract by the Combustion Power Company of Palo Alto, Calif. This is basically a special incinerator that burns household and commercial trash at high pressure to produce hot gases to power a turbine, which in turn drives an electrical generator.

As designed, the unit should produce approximately 15,000 kilowatts of electric power while burning 400 tons of municipal trash daily.

The incinerator-generator units could be installed at strategic points in urban areas, reducing hauling distances. For example, five such units could handle all the refuse from San Francisco, while about 40 units would be required for New York City.

THE LOATHSOME TRAIN

For a time, it appeared that one answer to the problems of major cities in disposing of their trash would be cart it away in trains. The fact is that close-in urban land has become too valuable for dumping and long-haul trucking costs are too high to dump at sites farther away. Trains could provide a cheaper service.

San Francisco's present rubbish-disposal site will be full in another year. Searching about, city officials decided on a new area 375 miles away in sparsely populated Lassen County, near the Nevada border. A tentative agreement was made with the Western Pacific Railroad to haul 1,500 tons of refuse daily to the fresh site at a cost of $8 a ton. Lassen County was to get 21 cents a ton for use of its land.

In mid-August, however, negotiations broke down in dispute over the length of the contract. The city wanted a 20-year term, but the railroad wanted to be committed only for 10 years.

Now San Francisco has an offer from the city of Mountain View, 35 miles to the south, of a 544-acre dumping ground that would be usable for five years.

New York considered a rail-haul plan for its waste several years ago, but the idea never got off the ground. A Philadelphia plan is stalled because of official doubts about the sanitary aspects of using old mines for disposal.

Denver and Milwaukee considered similar programs, but dropped them because of economic obstacles.

Chicago and Detroit are experimenting with equipment that compacts trash into blocks. The Japanese tried to use such blocks as building material. This failed because of decomposition, but experiments continue in use of the block to fill swampy land.

RISING COSTS

As the piles of trash climb higher, so does the expense of removal. Fees to householders in some of Washington's suburbs exceed $45 a year. In Milwaukee, annual rubbish-removal charges went up in 10 years from $26 to more than $35. New York officials estimate it costs $30 to dispose of a ton of trash.

Litter is not confined to America's cities, parks and highways. Ocean explorer Thor Heyerdahl reported recently in mid-Atlantic on his attempt to sail from Africa to South America in a reed boat. He noted large expanses of floating waste, including plastic bottles and containers, in the sea. "Man," he wrote, "is starting to pollute the open ocean."

And the Quinault Indians of Washington State have barred campers from 25 miles of scenic oceanfront. Reason. The white man was leaving too much litter on the Indians' reservation.

GOLDEN EAGLE PASSPORT PROGRAM

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on Friday of last week I moved that the Senate reconsider S. 2315, a bill to restore the golden eagle passport program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. I have no objection to the golden eagle passport program as proposed in S. 2315. However, I do object to section 3 of the bill which was added as a committee amendment and which would have the effect of authorizing the collection of entrance and admission fees at lakes and reservoirs under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Mr. President, it has been the longstanding policy of the U.S. Government, and this policy has been backed up by act of Congress, that entrance to and use of Federal lakes and reservoirs and inland waters shall be free to the general public.

As recently as 1968 in the Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act, the Congress restated that:

No entrance or admission fees shall be collected after March 31, 1970, by any officer or employee of the United States at public recreation areas located at lakes and reservoirs under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army. User fees at these lakes and reservoirs shall be collected by officers and employees of the United States only from users of highly developed facilities requiring continuous presence of personnel for maintenance and supervision of the facilities, and shall not be collected for access to or use of water areas, undeveloped or lightly developed shoreland, picnic grounds, overlook sites, scenic drives, or boat launching ramps where no mechanical or hydraulic equipment is provided.

Section 3 of S. 2315 would repeal the above prohibition against the collection of entrance or admission fees at U.S. Army Corps of Engineer projects. I intend on Wednesday of next week to offer an amendment to S. 2315 which would strike section 3 and would thus guarantee the continued free access to and use of Federal lakes and reservoirs under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Free entrance to and use of these waters has been a policy of the United States since the late 1700's, and this policy has been reaffirmed on numerous occasions during the past 200 years. I feel that free entrance to and use of these waters is sound national policy, and I feel certain that the Congress will once again this year reaffirm this policy, and I hope that my amendment on Wednesday is adopted.

I feel this is good policy because experience has shown it costs more than it is worth to try to collect these fees on these lakes and the collection process excludes too many people of modest means from their use.

AMERICA NEEDS MORE PUBLIC PARK LAND

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I invite the close attention of the Senate to articles from the Portland Oregonian on the pressures being placed upon our public parklands in Oregon, pressures which you may be sure are being felt all across this country as our population increases.

The latest move by the Budget Bureau in cutting back funds appropriated by Congress to acquire recreation and park land is but another glaring example of the inverse priorities that exist in this country today.

The Bureau has informed Congress that it will not permit use of the full $200 million voted for the acquisition of recreation and park lands. The Johnson administration cut these funds—inadequate to begin with—to $154 million, and now the Nixon administration further reduces the amount of $124 million which they say they will permit the Interior Department to spend.

The purchase of this beautiful outdoor recreation land is not just an exercise in aesthetics. We must consider the population pressures in this country, the growth in the numbers of young people, of more families and older people who

have an increased need for recreation and wise use of their leisure time.

Recreation park land builds part of the real sinew of the American people; it enhances the quality of our national life. As our cities become more congested, the lack of such wholesome recreation facilities will only exacerbate the problems of crime, delinquency, and misuse of leisure time.

I must also raise the question of the will of the people which was definitely expressed through the action of Congress in the enactment of this legislation to spend $200 million to acquire this needed land.

Congress is being thwarted by the nonelected Budget Bureau. The bureaucrats downtown have become a fourth branch of Government, isolated and secure. They seem totally unresponsive to the will of the people.

I do not believe that Congress ever intended to put this power of the veto into the hands of the Budget Bureau.

We in Oregon are particularly conscious of this ever-increasing need for new parks and for the expansion of existing recreation areas and campsites.

Oregon has some of the finest State parks in the country. The following articles from the Oregonian point out how extensively our State and national parks are used. You will note that Oregon parks are particularly crowded because of the tremendous growth in population in California.

The Federal Government is the largest single landowner in Oregon and it has not upheld its responsibility for the fullest use of this land.

There will doubtless be an effort by Congress to increase the funds when the appropriations bill for the Interior Department comes before the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD articles entitled "State Campers Veto Fee Hike to 'Outsiders,'" published in the Portland Oregonian.

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

STATE CAMPERS VETO FEE HIKE TO "OUTSIDERS"

(By Stan Federman)

"I pay taxes to help support our state parks. Then when I want to go camping I can't get into them."

Sound familiar?

It should. Oregon campers have been saying it loud and clear during the past summer vacation season.

They are particularly unhappy about the thousands of out-of-state campers—mainly from California and Washington—whom they accuse of crowding Oregonians out of their own state parks.

Last year about 1.3 million campers used Oregon parks. The total may hit 1.5 million this year.

What annoys Oregonians most is that 55 per cent of all these campers came from other states. In some state parks, more than 80 per cent of all camping was done by out-of-staters.

Both Oregon campers and state officials are seeking solutions to the critical out-of-state recreational explosion in our parks. Gov. Tom McCall and recreational experts are even beginning to suggest the state curtail some of its tourist promotion and advertising.

Discussing the problem at a recent meeting of recreational representatives, Glenn L. Jackson, chairman of the State Highway Commission, put the tourist question in blunt terms:

"Our crowded campgrounds and state parks are proof that we may be selling our heritage for a pittance."

Two proposals have been advanced in recent years as ways to possibly cut down the out-of-state camping in Oregon—and give residents a better opportunity to enjoy their own state parks.

One would involve charging nonresident campers a higher fee; the other would put state campgrounds on a reservation system.

To find out what campers themselves thought about the ideas, The Oregonian conducted a survey of Oregonians and nonresidents just prior to the Labor Day weekend. The study concentrated on Oregon's most crowded camping region—the 235-mile stretch of state parks on the coast between Astoria and Coos Bay.

Of those interviewed, 75 per cent were against any fee boosts for out-of-state campers.

Most campers—and particularly Oregonians—were strong in their belief that such an action was not only unfair and discriminatory but went against the age-old camping principle of "first come, first served."

Many Oregonians were realistic about any nonresident fee hike: If we start charging them more, their states will charge us more—and we'll all be in a recreational rat race.

On the reservations proposals, 57 per cent of interviewees frowned on the idea. But half of them said they would try it if it were initiated by the state.

Those campers who disliked reservations said they could not plan their vacations and weekend trips far enough in advance to take advantage of such a system. They also pointed out that most campers hate being tied down to any schedule.

Oregonians favoring the system felt it might assure them a site at their favorite campgrounds, something many could not count on these days. But others noted reservations would require a tremendous amount of paper work for the State Park Division and result in added costs to campers.

WHY THE BLANKETY-BLANK CAN'T I GET INTO MY OWN STATE PARKS? OREGON'S NATURAL MAGNETISM LEAVES TARDY NATIVES OUT IN COLD

(By Stan Federman)

The time was 5 p.m. on almost any day this past summer. The place was Fort Stevens State Park.

A long line of camping vehicles stretched out behind the registration booth at the main entrance. Almost all vehicles carried Oregon license plates.

Harried park aides attempted to explain to the newcomers that the park was presently filled to capacity. The aides said those in line could pull off to the side and wait for an opening. But they warned that at this hour it was unlikely more than a handful of the park's 483 units would be vacated that evening.

Some of the newcomers shrugged their shoulders and left to try for another campground along U.S. 101. A few said they would stay in a motel that night and come back the following morning. One or two hardier souls decided to wait for a possible opening.

And one red-faced camper began to argue angrily with the aides about being an Oregon taxpayer and "why the blankety-blank can't I get into my own state parks when I want to?"

DAMN FOREIGNERS

Before the aides could answer, a California car, whose owner had already registered and parked his trailer in the park some hours ago, sped by the waiting group of vehicles, returning from a shopping trip to nearby Astoria. As the car turned into the park, the irate Oregonian shook a fist at it and declared out loud to one and yet everyone in particular:

"There goes another one fom California. That's why we can't get into our parks. Those damn foreigners take all the camp sites."

And that's no joke—not if you were an Oregon camper this summer along the state's scenic 400-mile coast.

It was a scene repeated in park after park as Oregonian campers discovered once again they can no longer drive up to the park of their choice and grab a camp site any time of the day.

They could 10 years ago. Even four or five years ago. But no more.

OUTSIDERS KNOW

It was a fact of life on the coast this summer that if a camper needed a trailer hookup site, he had to be at a state park by 1 p.m. If he wanted an improved tenting site, he had to get there by 3 p.m.

Any time after those hours a family was usually shut out unless it got lucky and appeared at a park just as someone was vacating a site. But this doesn't happen very often during summer or weekends at most major camping parks.

The average Californian or Washingtonian or out-of-state camper from the East and Midwest is well aware of this fact. He learned the hard way living in crowded urban areas where you are an early-early bird or you stay home.

It was rare indeed this past summer that one found a California family, for example, shut out of an Oregon park because it got there too late. Californians know from experience. And they got there early.

But "getting there early" is a camping concept many Oregonians are just getting used to. As a result it is the Oregon camper who shows up at 5 or 6 p.m.—and winds up "left out."

This problem is even occurring on weekends most of the year at such popular coastal parks as Fort Stevens, Honeyman, Beverly Beach and Beachside. All draw heavily from Portland and Willamette Valley areas and they are jammed on most Saturdays and Sundays.

Some Portlanders solve the overcrowded problem by sending Momma and the kids down early Friday to nab a space while Poppa comes along later that evening after work. But this kind of "advanced planning" just to get a campsite distresses many Oregonians. Rather than go to all this trouble they will simply give up week-end camping at coastal parks.

There has been much talk in the last two years of raising out-of-state camping fees as a possible way to cut down the influx of these non-residents at Oregon parks.

But a recent survey by The Oregonian of coastal parks showed the idea has little flavor with most campers.

"You aren't going to stop the population explosion in camping with discriminatory fees," declared Gloyd Adams, a Lebanon rancher. "Other states don't discriminate against us and we shouldn't discriminate against them."

RECIPROCITY FEARED

"Our parks are the best in the country—that's why we get so many tourists in them," said Herb Griffith, a Eugene insurance adjuster. "But I travel a lot around the Western states—and I'd hate to have them charge me more for camping just because I was from Oregon."

Griffith's remark pointed up the salient belief by both Oregonians and non-residential campers that any such fee hike would bring immediate repercussions from other states.

Following a slight 50 cents to $1 increase this year, Oregon parks now charge $3 for a trailer hookup site, $2 for an improved tent site and $1 for an unimproved site. The prices were considered "reasonable" by most campers interviewed.

Emil Boucher, 10505 SE Boise St., a Portland truck driver, observed that Oregonians "were just going to have to plan their camping trips to avoid the most crowded times."

"Higher non-resident fees won't solve anything. It would only create ill will for the state and damage our tourist business."

IT'S BIG BUSINESS

Tourism is the state's third ranking industry and is expected to be No. 1 by the year 2000. But some state officials feel recent Oregon tourist promotions are bringing in tourists at too fast a rate for the state to absorb.

A few state voices claim the promotions attract only the camper-trailer tourist who they claim, doesn't spend enough to make his presence worthwhile. It has been suggested that future state advertising be aimed at the well-heeled tourist who lives in hotels and motels and is strictly the "big spender" for luxury travel.

But camper tourists spend money, too. According to the Oregon Tourist Bureau, campers spend more time in the state than non-campers (3.9 days to 3 days) and have more people (3.2) in their cars than non-campers (2.7). And—the camping family spends more per car per trip than the non-camping family: $82.29 vs. $74.95.

Many of those interviewed said they spent at least $100 weekly not counting gas and oil. Many spend much more; a Floridian said he averaged $40 daily, a British Columbia family spent $400 in less than two weeks.

WHY THE ADS

Most out-of-state campers become somewhat bitter when you discuss higher camping fees directed at them.

"I don't resent all the Oregonians who vacation in California, why should they resent it when my family goes camping here?" asked Mrs. J. J. Smith of Placerville, Calif., at Cape Lookout State Park.

"If you people don't want us, why do you coax us with big ads in national magazines?" asked Bud Stapleton, a retired marina operator from Pompano Beach, Fla., who was camping at Beverly Beach State Park.

"You people forget this overcrowded camping is a national problem and not just confined to Oregon. Heck, you can't get near a Florida campground during the winter season.

"We came because of the brochures your state sent us. When we came through Colorado we even heard your governor on the radio, urging tourists to come to Oregon. Well, we're here. We like it. We spend money. But you'd think we were a plague or something."

However, to Oregonians like the John Hendrickson family of Eugene the out-of-state campers are just "too much and too many."

The Hendricksons were interviewed just after being turned away at a filled-up Beachside State Park. And they were among the Oregonians supporting a higher fee for non-residents.

"And we shouldn't make it only $1 or $2 more," said Mr. Hendrickson. "We should really sock it to them. Another dollar or two isn't going to keep any affluent Californians out of our parks."

Jim Peterson, 7345 SE 46th Ave., another Portland trucker, couldn't agree more. "Oregonians should get first crack at their own camps. If higher non-resident fees will do it, I'm all for it."

Strangely enough, among Californians, almost 70 per cent interviewed agreed that a higher non-resident fee was "fair."

OUR PROBLEM WORSE

Ed Desmond, a publications supervisor from Mountain View, Calif., said he didn't blame Oregonians for getting all excited about the "new people" showing up at their campgrounds. "We've got the same problem, only much worse, in California. If your non-residential fee hike was needed, I wouldn't mind paying it."

School teacher Rodge Thomas of Garden Grove, Calif., said "If Californians like your state parks so much, they should pay for the privilege of using them. It's only fair—and they can afford it."

Washingtonians, for the most part, disliked the higher fee proposal and they warned that the two states could get into a "fee war" if such a proposal ever came to pass.

But some, like Dr. LaMar H. Gaw, an Olympia veterinarian for the Washington Department of Agriculture, said he'd be happy to pay any increased fee. Why? "Because you have such wonderful parks and provide such great services to campers."

AND, IT'S SILLY

Many persons doubted if any fee hike would stop out-of-staters from coming to Oregon parks. If they want to come, they'll be here, was the general consensus, regardless of the fee costs.

"This entire question of blaming non-residents for your overcrowded parks is really quite silly," said Denys J. Couch, a Vancouver, B.C., realtor. "It's all a tourist exchange, you know. We have thousands of Oregonians using our Canadian parks. Everyone travels these days and it all evens out for everyone in the long run."

Bruce Johnson, a Tacoma, Wash., designer, summed up the problem:

"Crowded parks are a part of tourism. If a state wants tourists—and which one doesn't—you learn to live with it. And you learn to live with each other. You have to . . . because the population explosion isn't limited to Oregon, it's happening all over America."

USERS DIVIDED ON MERITS OF PROPOSED CAMPGROUND RESERVATION SYSTEM

(By Stan Federman)

Three States—California, Florida and Vermont—presently operate reservation systems at their state campgrounds.

All other states offer their camp sites on a first come, first served basis.

Oregon park officials are still undecided whether a reservation system would work in this state. But they are considering it as one of several alternatives aimed at relieving some of the population pressures at state parks.

"We are studying the possibility of reservations but have reached no conclusions yet," declared David Talbot, state park director.

Talbot recently visited California to investigate the 2-year-old California park reservation system and discuss its pros and cons with that state's park chiefs.

The California system is fairly simple. Whether it is a success yet or not is something else.

If you wish to reserve a camp site in that state, you mail a $1 reservation fee directly to the park of your choice. You also include your regular camping fees for the number of days, up to a week, that you plan to stay.

The $1 reservation fee is not refundable, even should you decide to cancel out later on. And, if you do cancel out, you are charged an additional $1 "no show" fine.

Cancellations may be made up to the day of your reservation either through the mail or in person at the park. You will have your camping fees returned to you, but you lose the reservation fee and suffer the $1 fine. If you fail to show up entirely on your reservation date, you lose your camping fees, too.

SYSTEM SAID WORKING

California park officials say the system is working, but admit they are often plagued with "no shows" and families complain they can't plan ahead far enough on their vacations to use the system.

The state will only accept reservations up to June 30—and almost 80 per cent of all California camp sites were reserved for this summer season by April 1.

But the state is putting its reservation system on a computer basis in 1970 which will allow reservations to be made the year-around.

California campers, however, apparently are unhappy about the system so far, according to interviews made recently in an Oregonian survey of campgrounds along the Oregon coast.

"Our reservation system doesn't work because too many persons make reservations and then don't show up," declared O. C. Saddoris, an Azusa, Calif., engineer for the Southern Pacific Railroad.

"What happens is that anyone without reservations six months in advance figures he doesn't have a chance to get into a state campground in summer. So he doesn't even try. Then the reservation campers fail to show and you wind up with empty sites in the heart of the season."

Robert Belcher, a truck driver out of Garden Grove, Calif., pointed out that he was one of many who couldn't plan his vacation six and eight months in advance. "So we just don't use the system. It's not worth the trouble."

"Reservations—good or bad—take all the fun out of camping," said another Californian, Warren Reichert, Sunday editor for the Stockton Herald. The Reicherts planned to spend their vacation in the California redwoods area—but lost their camp site because they didn't have reservations. They came up to Oregon instead.

INFORMALITY LIKED

"We like the informality of camping up here," said Reichert. "If a person has to hold to a schedule like a train, what's the sense of going camping at all? We like to vagabond on vacation—to pick up and go whenever we feel like it. No reservations for us."

Jorgen Madsen, a Modesto, Calif., building materials salesman, said his family also liked to wander. "If we didn't we wouldn't be here in Oregon. We meant to go to Canada but fell in love with your Oregon coast and spent our entire vacation here."

Several Washingtonians, such as William Beck, a Tacoma insurance salesman, said they would like to "try" a reservations system. "Oregon might begin on a partial basis," said Beck, "perhaps reserving the first 20 per cent of all sites at each camp."

Oregonian campers, for the most part, seemed split on the reservation idea. But all of those interviewed were quite strong in their beliefs on whether or not it was needed.

Some like Bob Melton, a diesel engineer from The Dalls, said his family often had to wait two hours or more to get into the state park of their choice. But they preferred this to reservations.

"We've always had a first come, first serve system at our parks," he added. "And I don't think we should change it. We need reservations for everything we do today; it seems their should be something in our lives without reservations."

But campers like Mrs. Arnold Zimmer, 10760 NE Halsey St., feel reservations would be the answer to the overcrowded park problem—at least in major parks such as Ft. Stevens, Honeyman, Beverly Beach and Beachside on the coast.

RESERVATION FAVORED

"My husband and I have lived in Portland all our lives and now find we can't drive over to the coast and get into whatever state park we choose. It's ridiculous. It seems like four out of five cars this summer at Fort Stevens were from Washington, California and British Columbia.

"You bet I'm for reservations—and they should gear the system so it's Oregonians who get them first."

Michael Irwin, a Gaston lumber worker, thought reservations would help Oregonians

"reclaim" their parks. "We'd use them and so would a lot of our friends."

Most Oregonians believed reservations would be helpful if a family planned a long stay at one particular park. But they thought reservations would be of little use to the overnight camper or someone who goes to a state park on the spur of the moment.

Campers also feared there would be mistakes in the system. For example, a family might come into a camp with an Aug. 1 reservation and discover the park had them down for an Aug. 15 reservation.

There were suggestions that if the reservations became a reality, they should be on a "trial" basis in the beginning—either at one or two major parks or only used on weekends in the more populated camping areas.

Some proposed that Oregonians automatically receive a higher percentage of reserved sites than out-of-staters. Others suggested that no out-of-stater be allowed to reserve sites at more than two campgrounds during his visit to Oregon.

But whether campers discussed reservations or the controversial proposal of higher fees for non-resident campers almost all agreed on one method of solving the overcrowded park problem: build more parks.

Tuesday: The high cost of building camp sites.

MORE MONEY SAID ANSWER TO GLUTTED PARK CONDITION

(By Stan Federman)

Whenever campers gather in Oregon parks they talk about ways and means to relieve the "crowded feeling."

And the one solution almost all campers eventually agree on is perhaps the most difficult one of all to achieve; build more parks.

Oregon presently has 3,811 camping sites in its 220 parks. About 52 per cent are improved tent or trailer sites ($2 per night); 38 per cent are deluxe trailer hookup sites ($3 per night), and 10 per cent are unimproved sites ($1 per night).

The state's improved and trailer hookup sites are almost double those of California, whose 7,500 state camping sites are mostly unimproved or primitive. They are of little use to the trailer-pickup camper crowd which normally needs hookup sites for water, electricity and sewage.

In its recent survey of the camping scene on the Oregon coast The Oregonian ran into a constant feud between trailer campers and tent campers.

The trailer camper was angry that the tent camper often grabbed a camp site with a hookup he didn't need; the tenter complained the trailer people took over improved tent sites when they couldn't find any available hookup sites.

FEUD CONTINUES

Each accused the other of being responsible for some of the overcrowded conditions and problems of camping at state parks.

Each type of camper wants the state—or someone—to build more campgrounds. But the tenter wants tent sites; the trailer crowd wants hookups.

At present, the tenter seems to be losing the battle as new camp sites more and more are being devoted to trailer hookups. At some parks along the crowded coast, for example, trailer hookups completely dominate the campgrounds.

And there is no doubt trailering has become the new way of camping in Oregon. Some 63 per cent or more of all campers at state parks this past year were in trailers or camper vehicles.

But this type of camping trend presents a tremendous problem to state park officials who are as anxious as anyone to build more parks. The problem is simple: money.

At today's prices, it takes $3,500 to $4,000 to build a trailer hookup site. The cost includes not only construction but the price of roads, water, sewage facilities and other wanted necessities.

When a camper casually suggests the state build another 1,000 hookup sites to relieve that "crowded feeling" at state parks, he's talking about a $4 million bill.

The State Park Division, an arm of the Oregon Highway Department, has a present operating budget of about $7 million annually—simply not enough to build all the sites most campers would like.

Besides building what many believe are the best campgrounds in the nation, the state also manages to keep them on a fairly self-sustaining basis.

Last year the state spent $838,000 in operating the camping phase of its park system. Income from camping fees totaled $710,000.

This left a $128,000 deficit—but an enviable record. Oregon is perhaps one of only two or three states in the country that came that close last year to balancing its camping ledgers. California, for example, had an operating deficit of $5 million.

This year, Oregon increased its camping fees slightly. It is anticipated by state park officials that this action will put the state on a fully self-sustaining basis in 1969 for its camping program.

Most campers feel the state should not have to battle the recreational population explosion all by itself. They think the federal government should step into the camping picture and provide grants to states for camp site construction.

The State Highway Commission couldn't agree more. Commissioners believe the federal government should not only "think Oregon" but also "think California" where Oregon's park system is concerned.

"We service so many Californians in our parks that we should get credit for this," says Commission Chairman Glenn L. Jackson.

Besides state camp sites, there are more than 7,000 U.S. Forest Service and 509 Bureau of Land Management camping sites in Oregon. But so far these have done little to relieve crowded conditions at state parks.

Most Forest Service and BLM campgrounds are unimproved or primitive in nature. They have pit rather than flush toilets. They provide no showers, wood and other camping luxuries offered by state parks.

EXTRAS WANTED

"Those unimproved federal campgrounds 10 and 15 miles from nowhere aren't the answer for today's camper," says David McClernon, 11710 NE Eugene St., a Portland dairy freezer operator. "Most campers have trailers. They don't use unimproved sites anymore. They all want the little extras provided by the state parks."

Ted Robertson, a Sacramento, Calif., contractor, says the government should give money to the states and let them build the campgrounds, designed along the lines of those found in Oregon.

"Your park people could give a lesson to every state in the country on how to build a modern campground."

Bob Pirolo, a Seattle bakery driver, says the government and national timber companies are far behind their promises of turning land into multipurpose uses, with emphasis on recreation.

"Let's face it—much of Oregon and Washington are in federal land or private timber land. We need more of these lands to be developed for recreation or we're never going to beat this population explosion problem."

With Californians taking the brunt of recent criticism by Oregon campers who claim the Golden Staters are shutting them out of their own parks, there are many who probably would agree with a proposal by Mrs. Darrell Draper, 6029 N. Williams Ave.

She also would like to see the federal government get into the "camping business" on an ever-increasing basis. But she wants them to build more campgrounds in California not Oregon.

"Then maybe the Californians would stay home and let us Oregonian campers have our parks back," she said.

ATLANTIC COAST COMMERCIAL DISASTER AREA COULD BE OMEN OF OREGON FATE

(By A. Robert Smith)

HYANNIS, MASS.—The Atlantic Coast is fast becoming a disaster area—and it's the sort of disaster that could strike and destroy much that is glorious about the Oregon coast.

This is not a natural disaster, such as Hurricane Camille recently visited upon the Gulf Coast.

It is a man-made disaster, a peculiarly American form of destruction which is all the worse because it could have been prevented.

During the month of August this correspondent traveled about two-thirds the length of the Atlantic Coast, from the rock-bound shores of Maine to the sandy beaches of the Carolinas.

Comparisons with the Oregon coast, which I visited most recently last summer, are inevitable—and they are frightening for anyone who loves the natural beauty of coastal America.

Geologists tell us that the coasts of our continent are constantly changing, shaped and reshaped by pounding surf and howling winds. But generally these changes constitute an exchange of one form of natural beauty for another.

Much of the change brought by man, especially in the past decade, seems to be for the worse, an exchange of natural beauty for the garish devices of the commercial marketplace—signboards by the tens of thousands, drive-ins, deluxe shopping centers, etc.

At the entrance to Cape Cod, just after you cross the Cape Cod Canal, one national food store chain has posted a sign listing all its supermarkets on the cape. The list is too long to count without stopping the car—a symbol of the vast change one soon laments here.

Hyannis, once an interesting village of shops and art galleries in the pre-Kennedy era, has become another plastic town, its commercial district dominated by chain stores in vast shopping centers. The tourist who craves this should feel very much at home, which raises the question: why leave home at all? Traffic jams at the coast are no more relaxing than those back home.

Many of the towns on Cape Cod have suffered the same commercial transformation, exchanging the charm of yesterday for the efficient impersonal methods of modern merchandising.

One might be tempted to dismiss this profitable blight as a consequence of the Kennedy era that attracted so much attention to Cape Cod and made it perhaps the most glamorous spa in the country. As a senator, the late John Kennedy left a better legacy by authoring the Cape Cod National Seashore act. Today one substantial portion of the cape stands preserved against the bulldozers and asphalt spreaders—and the National Park Service has done well in managing it, an island of natural splendor in a sea of frantic exploiters.

Farther up the coast, Maine is only slightly less victimized by the fast buck artists. This was my first visit to Maine, the last of the 50 states I have visited in years of traversing the country, and my wife's comment summed up our disappointment: "Maine would have been an appealing place to live—100 years ago."

MERCHANTS BENEFIT

Maine has much of the natural attraction of Oregon—vast forests, over a thousand lakes, a rugged coast. But what God created, man has been working overtime to put asunder. It is here that the disaster of commercial blight seems altogether unexcusable—a nightmare of what may be ahead for Oregon, if proper preventive action is delayed much longer.

Maine has become a terrible example of poor or non-existent local zoning. The local city fathers, undoubtedly faced with the de-

cline of the fishing and logging industries, welcomed the advent of tourism as a clean industry from which all would benefit. Certainly, this must have been the result for the merchants on Main Street.

One indicator of the massive proportions of the tourist invasion there is this: driving about 100 miles up the coast from Rockland to Acadia National Park we passed perhaps 500 motels, all of them with their "no vacancy" sign turned on.

What the city dwellers of New York and Jersey City and Baltimore have done is to overrun Maine and Cape Cod, not to mention the much closer Jersey and Virginia beaches, so that the entire Atlantic Coast is becoming one elongated Coney Island.

The great growth of California suggests that the same treatment is in store for Oregon. It's not a question of how to attract tourists but how to handle them and serve them without repeating the uglification of the coast that mocks and torments the seeker of solitude by the sea.

JOB CORPS RECREATION

(By Roberts Olmos)

WALDPORT.—Fishermen, campers, picnickers and lovers of the outdoors can give thanks to men of the Angell Job Corps camp for choice recreation areas the youths have built, revamped or are in the process of readying.

"It would be years before the public would have access to some of these spots if it weren't for the Job Corps men," said Millard Mitchell, new director at Camp Angell, located south of this city.

In learning carpentry, painting and general construction vocations, Job Corps trainees are assigned to various U.S. Forest Service projects in the Siuslaw National Forest. The Forest Service operates Camp Angell.

PROJECTS LISTED

During the past four years, men from the conservation center have given the Forest Service:

Ten new or rehabilitated campgrounds which represent 157 campsites.

Eight new comfort stations, some with steps, stone work and landscaping.

Thirteen rock work projects, including construction of steps providing easy access to riverside fishing spots.

Fourteen trails and 14 footbridges. The trails represent eight miles of additional hiking area in the Siuslaw.

STORM BLAMED

Five landscape projects.

Largest of the campsite developments is Alder Dunes, 10 miles north of Florence. Completed but not open to the public until next year, the campsite will feature 47 new campsites.

The Sutton Creek campground, nine miles north of Florence, remained virtually unusable by the public because of the tangled mess that covered it due to the "Columbus Day" windstorm in 1962.

Job Corps men cleared debris at Sutton Creek, built a new 600-foot walkway and did major rehabilitation work there, according to Gene Gustafson, Camp Angell's assistant director.

It took the corpsmen a year to ready the Sutton Creek campsite.

PROGRESS SEEN

A spot that is bound to become a favorite with outdoors lovers will be the Blackberry campground along the Alsea River between Waldport and Alsea. The basic camp layout—all new—will be completed by November. But it will take many months more before over-all development is finished. The site will be open to overnight camping as well as picnicking. A boat ramp also is being readied.

The arduous work behind such developments was clearly evident in a visit to the Maples campground, located off Highway 34 on the Alsea River, east of Blackberry.

Here crews were felling and bucking several dozen trees in order to "open up" the site and provide sunlight. Chain saws buzzed and heavy equipment roared.

Forest Service experts designate which trees are to be felled.

COMMUNITIES AIDED

Some of the Job Corps crews are taken to the project sites daily, returning in the evening to Camp Angell. At other locations, the men set up what are called "spike camps" which they leave on week-ends only. A "spike camp" has been located at the Alsea Ranger District station, where the men are building a huge, open bay storage shed.

Corpsmen also have donated time and labor to community improvement projects. They built a visitors' information center for the City of Yachats and prepared and fenced a Little League field at Waldport.

Mitchell feels work the men are doing will further benefit the community because the youths are being readied for apprenticeship programs that eventually will lead them into trades crying out for experienced hands.

"The median age of workers in the carpentry and painting trades in this area is 50. Those men will be retiring soon and someone is going to have to replace them," Mitchell pointed out.

WITHDRAWAL BY UTAH OF PETITION FOR CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, today I invite the Senate's attention to an extraordinarily important decision by the Federal district court in Utah. The court ordered the secretary of state of Utah to withdraw its petition from Congress calling for a Constitutional Convention because that petition had been sent by a constitutionally malapportioned legislature. This decision is a landmark in the fight to preserve our Constitution from those who seek to overturn the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decisions through the untried and dangerous route of a Constitutional Convention.

First, let me say that the decision reduces the number of applications from States to Congress for a convention to 31. As I noted last month, the attorney general of Oklahoma has held that State's call to be invalid under State law. Now, under Federal law, Utah's petition is also held to be of no effect. The chances of three State legislatures petitioning Congress this year are very small, so the required two-thirds mark of 34 States will not be met.

Second, and more important, this decision is a precedent that, when applied by other courts or Congress to the remaining applications, will reduce the number of valid applications to a mere handful.

Because of the complexity of the question of jurisdiction in the Utah case, some confusion has resulted in interpreting its holding. Therefore, I would like to discuss the opinion at some length today to make the record unequivocally clear. The decision in question is Petuskey against Rampton, an action originally brought in 1965 before a three-judge court, which held Utah's reapportionment act of 1963 unconstitutional because of malapportionment. The three-judge court retained its jurisdiction over the case pending a satisfactory reapportionment of Utah's Legislature.

In 1969, new petitioners sought to intervene in the dormant case to declare Utah's petition to Congress passed by the old, malapportioned legislature null and void. These new plaintiffs sought to enter in this case reasoning that they were merely requesting further relief flowing from the decision's central holding of malapportionment.

The three-judge court met to hear the petition for intervention and rejected the action as inappropriate for the three-judge court and as improper for the prior malapportionment case. The two judges who held this way did not, under any conceivable interpretation of their action, decide or approach the merits of the petition. The majority merely felt that the case belonged by itself in the Federal district court.

District court Judge Ritter, who dissented on the question of permitting intervention in the old case, then proceeded to hear the petitioners as a district court judge sitting alone. His decision, based squarely upon prior law, is certainly unequivocal. It begins:

> Can a legislature, which has been determined unconstitutionally apportioned by a three-judge Federal Court, adopt a valid Resolution applying to Congress to call an Article V Convention for the purpose of continuing its own unconstitutional existence? The answer to this question is that the Legislature is not empowered to do so.

Judge Ritter, relying upon the long line of cases involving ratification of constitutional amendments, especially *Hawke* v. *Smith* (No. 1), 253 U.S. 221 (1920), held that the act of a State legislature in calling for an amendment to the Constitution by way of a convention, like the ratification of such an amendment, "is not an act of legislation within the proper sense of the word." The district court reasoned that the word "legislature" in the beginning of article V must have the same meaning—as construed by the Supreme Court many years ago—as it does in the end of article V. Thus the action of petitioning Congress for a convention, like ratification of an amendment is Federal action, controlled by Federal, and especially constitutional standards.

The court continued that it is absolutely clear that the equal protection clause now requires State legislatures to be equally apportioned. The only way this can be changed, short of revolution, is an amendment to the Constitution. The question is whether the Federal action of proposing and ratifying the Constitution can be made unconstitutionally? Certainly not. Can an attempt to alter the meaning of the equal protection clause be allowed that proceeds under a disregard of that clause as it now stands? Certainly not. No court can allow parts of the Constitution to be suspended—especally those parts toward which the proposed change is aimed—while the procedure for change is underway.

The court is clear, and its point is simple: If State legislatures want to change the one-man, one-vote aspects of the equal protection clause, they can do

it only after proper amendment, not before the amendment process is complete, and not during the amendment process. As the Utah court states it:

Hardly less shocking [than an attempt to suspend the Bill of Rights during the consideration of an amendment] is the supposition that the operation of the Equal Protection Clause, as construed by the Supreme Court, would be suspended during the time an amendment to alter it was being considered.

Hence, any attempt to repeal the Equal Protection Clause, as the Court interprets it, that violates the "one man-one vote" right of the people is subject to challenge. "That right remains in effect until repealed and must necessarily span the amending process."

This decision will invalidate the last, desperate acts of the malapportioned legislatures. Knowing that they could not justify their continuation before the courts, certain that their existence was doomed by the oncoming votes of the majority, propped up by gerrymandering and a gross distortion of the voting process, these men have attempted one last gamble to preserve their unfair and unconstitutional grip over our State legislatures. Pretending that they represented a majority in their States, they have attempted to call a constitutional convention to save themselves.

But just as the courts have refused to let these rotten-borough legislatures to continue to rule their respective States, so too the courts and Congress must not permit these unrepresentative representatives from distorting the amending process, exempting it from the fifth amendment, and possibly destroying our Constitution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD that portion of Judge Ritter's opinion dealing with this question and his order invalidating Utah's petititon to Congress for all those interested in further examinaton of this vital topic.

I believe that this decision is the crushing blow to this ill-advised and ill-conceived movement to change our Constitution. When applied across the Nation, it will clearly demonstrate how few people desire this change, and how few of the people's elected representatives—when elected representatively—favor the change.

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

[In the U.S. District Court in and for the District of Utah, Central Division]

WILLIAM G. PETUSKEY, AND OTHERS, PLAINTIFFS, VERSUS CALVIN L. RAMPTON AS GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF UTAH, AND OTHERS, DEFENDANTS, AND BRIAN FLORENCE, PLAINTIFF IN INTERVENTION

(Preliminary injunction order, Civil No. C-7-63)

To: The defendant Clyde L. Miller, secretary of state, State of Utah, and to his attorney, Vernon B. Romney, attorney general of Utah:

You and each of you will please take notice:

1. The application of Brian Florence to intervene in the above-entitled action is hereby granted and the Motion of the original plaintiffs, William G. Petuskey, Robert A. Bullough, Clinton M. Black, Farrol R. Lambert, to file their supplemental complaint is hereby granted;

2. On the basis of the opinion of the Court by the Honorable Willis W. Ritter, Chief Judge, filed August 6, 1969, this Court finds that a Preliminary Injunction Order must be issued to prevent irreparable injury.

3. It appearing that the adoption, by any additional state, of a Resolution similar to S. J. R. No. 3 of the 1965 Utah Legislature may lodge in Congress the applications of the two-thirds of the several states necessary to require Congress to call a constitutional convention, that such additional Resolution may be adopted by any one of several states whose legislatures are currently in session, that the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin currently has under active consideration, and may soon adopt, such a Resolution, and that if such additional Resolution is adopted and submitted to Congress prior to the recall of the Utan Resolution, the Utah Resolution may be placed beyond effective recall by the plaintiffs, the Court finds that these circumstances threaten irreparable injury to plaintiffs right to vote, both as qualified voters and as Legislators of the State of Utah;

4. No bond or other security for costs or damages is required herein;

Now, therefore, it is hereby ordered:

1. That the defendant Clyde L. Miller is restrained and commanded by the Order of this Court, requiring him to advise the Congress of the United States, that the validity of S. J. R. No. 3, adopted by the 1965 Utah State Legislature, is questioned by this action, that until the validity of said Resolution is determined, his authority to submit said Resolution to Congress is in doubt, and that he must require the return of said Resolution, pending the ultimate disposition of this action;

2. A copy of this Order and the Opinion of this Court shall be personally served upon the defendant Clyde L. Miller, by the United States Marshal;

3. It is further Ordered that this Order shall be effective from and after 6 o'clock p.m., August 6, 1969.

Dated at Salt Lake City, Utah, this 6 day of August, 1969.

By the Court:

WILLIS W. RITTER,
Chief Judge, U.S. District Court.

JUDGE RITTER'S OPINION DISSENTING AS MEMBER OF THREE-JUDGE COURT, AND HIS OPINION AS CHIEF JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH, TO WHOM THIS CASE WAS ORIGINALLY ASSIGNED

* * * * *

III

Can a Legislature, which has been determined unconstitutionally apportioned by a three-judge Federal Court adopt a valid Resolution applying to Congress to call an Article V convention for the purpose of continuing its own unconstitutional existence?

The answer to this question is that the Legislature is not empowered to do so.

For the purposes of this proceeding we propose only to show the substantiality of the Federal Constitutional question involved, the case being set down with the filling of this opinion, for plenary hearing with full briefing and argument on the merits.

We take it that Baker v. Carr,[1] Reynolds v. Sims,[2] the series of five other cases[3] decided at the same time, and cases decided since, by the Supreme Court, have settled any problem of "standing", justiciability, and "political question" so far as this matter is concerned, for in our view it is a proceeding to implement and enforce the decrees in the two Utah Reapportionment cases, supra, still pending before the District Judge.

The United States Supreme Court has considered without hesitation the line of cases involving the validity of ratification of constitutional amendments.[4] The first, Hawke v. Smith (No. 1), 253 U.S. 221 (1920), is of considerable importance to our discussion here.

The constitution of Ohio extended the referendum procedure to any ratification by the legislature of proposed amendments to the Federal Constitution.

The Ohio legislature ratified the 18th Amendment (Prohibition). A citizen-taxpayer-voter of Ohio sued to restrain the Secretary of State of Ohio from spending public money to prepare and print ballots for the referendum.

The Supreme Court of the United States reversed the Ohio Supreme Court and unanimously held the provisions of the state constitution requiring a referendum were in conflict with Article V of the Constitution of the United States.

The only question really for determination, said the Court, is: "What did the framers of the Constitution mean in requiring ratification by 'Legislatures' "?

The Court (which included Holmes and Brandeis) answered: "The argument to support the power of the State to require the approval by the people of the State of the ratification of amendments to the Federal Constitution through the medium of a referendum rests upon the proposition that the Federal Constitution requires ratification by the legislative action of the States through the medium provided at the time of the proposed approval of an amendment. This argument is fallacious in this—ratification by a State of a constitutional amendment is not an act of legislation within the proper sense of the word. It is but the expression of the assent of the State to a proposed amendment.

* * * *"It is true that the power to legislate in the enactment of laws of a State is derived from the people of the State. But the power to ratify a proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution has its source in the Federal Constitution. The act of ratification by the State derives its authority from the Federal Constitution to which the State and its people have alike assented."

The word "legislatures" in the ratification clause of Article V does not mean the whole legislative process of the state—as defined in the state constitution. Hawke v. Smith says it means the representative lawmaking body only, because "ratification by a state of a constitutional amendment is not an act of legislation within the proper sense of the word."

No doubt the word "legislatures" has the same meaning in the application clause that it bears in the ratification clause of Article V. The application is not "an act of legislation" within the proper sense of the word.

The court in Hawke v. Smith declares that Article V is a grant of authority by the people to Congress. It provides "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments." Hence, "when state legislatures petition Congress for an Article V convention they act not as lawmakers under their state constitution but rather as agents of the Federal government performing a federal function. That is, they are acting as 'representatives of the people of the state under the power granted by

[1] 369 U.S. 186 (1962).

[2] 377 U.S. 533 (1964).

[3] *Davis* v. *Mann*, 377 U.S. 670 (1964); *Lucas* v. *Colorado*, 377 U.S. 713 (1964); *Maryland Committee* v. *Tawes*, 377 U.S. 656 (1964); *Roman* v. *Sincock*, 377 U.S. 695 (1964); *WMCA, Inc.* v. *Lomenzo*, 377 U.S. 633 (1964).

[4] *Hawke* v. *Smith* (No. 1), 253 U.S. 221 (1920); *National Prohibition Cases*, 253 U.S. 350, 386 (1920); *Leser* v. *Garnett*, 258 U.S. 130, 137 (1922); *Fairchild* v. *Hughes*, 258 U.S. (1922); *United States* v. *Sprague*, 282 U.S. 716; *Coleman* v. *Miller*, 307 U.S. 433 (1939).

Article V. The article therefore imports a function different from that of lawmaker and renders inapplicable the conditions which usually attach to the making of state laws.' " [5]

During the time the procedure for amending the Constitution is being pursued as provided in Article V, the provision sought to be amended, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, remains in effect until the amending process is completed. It shocks one to suppose that the operation of the Bill of Rights would be suspended during a time an amendment to alter or repeal it was being considered.

"Any attempt to repeal the Bill of Rights that violated those rights in the process of repeal therefore would be subject to challenge. In this sense constitutional government, short of revolution, is not reversible."

Hardly less shocking is the supposition that the operation of the Equal Protection Clause, as construed by the Supreme Court, would be suspended during the time an amendment to alter it was being considered.

Hence any attempt to repeal the Equal Protection Clause, as the Court interprets it, that violates the "one man—one vote" right of the people is subject to challenge. "That right remains in effect until repealed and must necessarily span the amending process."

The Utah legislature, which had been judicially determined unconstitutionally apportioned, violated that right during the amending process by adopting SJR3 calling upon Congress to convene an Article V convention.

In an essay on this subject suggesting the ideas just expressed, one writer, Peter H. Wolf, 52 American Bar Association Journal, p. 329–330, says: "The Constitution has been authoritatively and unequivocally interpreted to require that 'the seats in both houses of a bicameral state legislature must be apportioned on a population basis'. The very least the constitutional axiom requires is that when a state legislature participates in the amending process—the only specifically delineated function of state legislatures under the Federal Constitution—concerning an impairment of constitutional rights as embodied in that legislature's own composition, the courts will demand that that legislature accurately reflect the only majority by which our system permits impairment of such rights. Thus, a malapportioned state legislature may not lawfully ratify a constitutional amendment that might permit that malapportionment to be perpetuated."

Observing that this situation is unique in our constitutional history, the writer says: "For not only does a proposed antireapportionment amendment specifically impair a pre-existing constitutional right, but its ratification by legislatures that maybe malapportioned attempts alteration by means that inherently violate that same constitutional right. The outcome of each challenge can logically and constitutionally result only in an invalidation of a malapportioned state legislature's bootstrap ratification of its own unconstitutional composition."

The situation has evoked many other expressions to describe it. Senator Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut says these proposed amendments would allow "the rotten boroughs to decide whether they should continue to be rotten." Senator Proxmire of Wisconsin says to regard such resolution as valid "would be like permitting all Democrats to have two votes in a referendum to determine whether or not Democrats should have two votes." Senator Tydings of Maryland argues such a legislature has no competence to initiate amendments to the Constitution "to make legal its own illegality."

[5] Bonfield, The Dirksen Amendment and the Article V Convention Process, 66 Michigan Law Review 949, 959 (March 1968).

Another expression which should be added is that this proposed amendment would allow the unconstitutional legislators to feather their own nests.

In testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments given by Royce Hanson, associate professor of government at American University, he stated:

"Finally, S.J. Res. 2 provides for ratification by the legislatures of the States. This procedure for this amendment presents every legislature with an irresistible conflict of interest. Every member has a personal interest in the amendment. Too often such interests exceed the public interest. If legislatures were to vote on it, I think we can predict in about every State where the legislature is under court mandate to reapportion, lawsuits challenging the capacity of a malapportioned legislature to sit in judgment of this amendment, would occur. Even if all the suits are lost, it seems to me incredible that the Congress would be a party to *so cozy an arrangement* as this procedure permits."

Mr. Wolf, of the District of Columbia Bar, in article referred to supra, says: "Professor Hanson's misgivings that ratification would be far more on the level of self-preservation than on the higher plane of constitutional concern are amply illustrated by the fact that some state legislatures that have enacted reapportionment plans under court order have provided that the plans shall be immediately and automatically rescinded if an antireapportionment amendment becomes effective. Similar misgivings arise from a realization of the misleading quality of question used as the battle cry of those supporting an antireapportionment amendment—'What is wrong with letting the people decide?' It is not the people who would ratify an antireapportionment amendment; it is the state legislatures. If 'letting the people decide' refers to the referendum provisions of the Dirksen amendment, those provisions are totally irrelevant to the amending process itself."

What this court said in Petuskey v. Rampton, supra, pages 369, 371, 373–374, applies: "There is a whole nest of vipers in this section. More difficult, puzzling questions you are not likely to find. They arise out of the attempt of the legislators to continue themselves in office as long as possible * * *."

It is manifest this situation is monstrous, in a small way. It is wholly lacking in rationality. The Legislature has set up a scheme that too long will delay constitutional reapportionment and equal representation in the Utah Legislature.

* * * "But Utah's legislatures have never shown any enthusiasm for reapportionment on the basis of population. This one was no exception.

"It is manifest in the 1965 Act that the legislators sought to continue themselves in office until the end of their elected terms, eleven senators until December 31, 1968. And this, in face of the fact that the acts under which they had been elected had been held unconstitutional and moreover were repealed by them. For a very long period of time all efforts to obtain a constitutionally apportioned Legislature in this State have been frustrated. There is now a further unfortunate delay until January 1967 before we shall have a constitutionally apportioned Legislature." [6]

[6] It is interesting to note the speed by which the last State Legislature memorialized Congress (S.J.R. #5) to call a constitutional convention to provide for reapportionment "on factors other than population", which resolutions the State Senate passed on the tenth day of the session, compared to the Legislature's hesitancy to properly reapportion under the mandate of this court, which action occurred on the final (sixtieth) day of the session.

In Petuskey v. Clyde, supra, dissenting opinion, the writer said: "I fully agree that it is the primary duty of the Utah Legislature to reapportion so as to establish a valid representation in the legislature. But, it has never done so, not once, since statehood.

"This State has a long history of frustrated attempts to reapportion.

* * * "One reason for this abstention was to give the legislature an opportunity to apportion constitutionally.

"Well, they didn't. The pendency of this action in this court, and of the many actions in the United States Supreme Court and other courts did not have the desired effect upon the legislature. The legislators met in 1963 and came out for a formula that is patently wrong."

In Petuskey v. Rampton, supra, this court held: "And particularly, nothing we do today is to be interpreted as authorizing legislative action with respect to any amendment which may be proposed to the Constitution of the United States to permit apportionment including factors other than population.

"* * * Should the Legislature, between now and January 1, 1967, attempt to ratify any proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States to apportion one or both houses of the Legislature on factors other than population, it will be this court's duty to give further consideration to the necessity of giving plaintiffs injunctive and affirmative relief by judicial decree, and for such purpose we again retain jurisdiction.

"Having regard to the long period of time during which all efforts to obtain a constitutionally apportioned Legislature have been frustrated in this State, and to the further unfortunate delay until January 1967 before we shall have a constitutionally apportioned Legislature, well-known general principles of equity require that the Legislature not consider or vote upon any proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States on the subject of legislative reapportionment."

Petuskey v. Rampton, supra, was a final judgment from which no appeal was taken; and the foregoing is the law of the case, applicable in the present proceeding. It is a plain holding of the court and we ought to feel bound by it. Instead the judges' order of July 8, 1969 backs down from it and attempts to overrule it. This, in my view, is a disorderly retreat from a sound and just position.

Based upon ideas of practicality, the ordinary, customary legislation needed to keep a state government going, has been held valid though the legislature is unconstitutionally apportioned.

There isn't the same practical problem in holding void the legislators' attempt to continue themselves in their illegal state of unconstitutional apportionment. And there certainly isn't the violation of "some fundamental principle of justice, some prevalent conception of good morals, some deep-rooted tradition of the common weal." (Cardozo, 120 N.E. at p. 202) that there is in allowing themselves to feather their own nest, in hopeful expectation that it will be in perpetuity.

Decisions of the United States Supreme Court arising out of the Civil War provide apt analogies. "As a rule, the official actions of the de facto but not de jure Confederate state governments were recognized as valid. However, efforts of those governments that were directed toward the perpetuation of the very things that made them de facto rather than de jure were deemed void. For example, bonds issued in aid of their prosecution of the war against the United States were held unenforceable." 66 Mich. L.R. 949.

There is one much discussed case, Fortson, Secretary of State of Georgia, v. Toombs, 379 U.S. 621 (1965), in which the Supreme Court, *per curiam*, has indicated its views on the power of malapportioned legislatures to sub-

mit a state constitutional reapportionment amendment to the people directly.

A three-judge district court in Georgia held the legislature malapportioned, allowed the 1964 election to be held under existing statutes, but restricted the power of the legislature so chosen, *inter alia*, by enjoining the legislature from submitting an entirely new constitution to the people for adoption until it was reapportioned.

The *per curiam* decision of the Court reads: "The situation has changed somewhat since the 1964 election, as both the Senate and House have new members, and appellees, for whose benefit the challenged provision was added, say it is now highly speculative as to what the 1965 legislature will do and suggest the paragraph in question be vacated as moot.

"We vacate this part of the decree and remand to the District Court, to whom we give a wide range in moulding a decree, for reconsideration of the desirability and need for the on-going injunction in light of the results of the 1964 election and the representations of appellees."

The opinion of Justices Harlan and Stewart concurring in part and dissenting in part (page 623) reads: "This is the first time that the Court, after plenary briefing and argument, has been called on to consider the propriety of interim arrangements prescribed by a district court pending the effectuation of its decision requiring reapportionment of a branch of a state legislature."

On page 624 Justice Harlan says: "The Court's disposition of this case, of course, involves a holding that at least as to item (2) the case is not moot. For, contrary to what my Brother Goldberg says in his dissenting opinion (pp. 636–638) and my Brother Clark seems to recognize (ante), the Court does not remand the case to the District Court for a determination on the issue of mootness, but only to decide whether any injunctive relief is now appropriate in light of what has transpired since such relief was first granted."

The per curiam disposition of the majority indicates approval by the Supreme Court of the lower Court's injunction, and moreover, it is a decision that the unconstitutionally apportioned legislature's attempt to propose its own wholly new constitution to the people was invalid.

One year after Fortson v. Toombs, five members of the court, through Justice Black, asserted that the same Georgia legislature was empowered to select the governor under the Georgia constitution since neither Howard Callway nor Lester Maddox received a majority of the votes cast. Fortson v. Morris, 385 U.S. 231 (1966). Chief Justice Warren and Justices Douglas, Brennan and Fortas dissented.

Wherefore, the Court makes the following Findings and Orders:

1. The plaintiffs in the original reapportionment suit, Petuskey v. Rampton, should be and hereby are granted leave to file and serve the Supplemental Complaint, for the reasons and upon the grounds set out in their verified Consent to Intervention and Motion to file Supplemental Complaint dated July 1, 1969 and in their Memorandum dated and filed July 2, 1969, Paragraph 3 on page 8 thereof, through and including pages 9, 10 and to the middle of page 11, all of which is referred to and incorporated herein by reference.

2. Brian Florence should be and is hereby granted leave to intervene as a plaintiff in this action in order to assert his claim in Intervention for additional Relief for the reasons and upon the grounds set forth in his verified Motion to Intervene as a Plaintiff and Claim in Intervention for Additional Relief, filed June 6, 1969, and in his Memorandum dated and filed July 2, 1969, Paragraph 5, (which should be numbered 4), on page 11 thereof, through and including pages 12, 13 and 14, all of which is referred to and incorporated herein by reference.

3. Original plaintiffs' prayer for a preliminary injunction mandatorily requiring Clyde L. Miller, Secretary of State of Utah, or other proper officer, to advise Congress of the actions taken by this Court declaring the invalidity and unconstitutionality of S.J.R. No. 3 and requesting the withdrawal of said Resolution should be and is hereby granted and counsel is directed to prepare the necessary papers. Dated this 6th day of August, 1969

WILLIS W. RITTER,
Chief Judge, U.S. District Court.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS ENDORSES MURPHY URBAN AND RURAL EDUCATION BILL

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the very first organization to endorse the Urban and Rural Education Act, S. 2625, which I introduced on July 15, was the American Federation of Teachers.

The day after S. 2625 was introduced in the Senate, the AFT's president, Mr. David Selden, and legislative director, Mr. Carl Megal, testified before the Senate Education Subcommittee. Having been given a copy of my bill and introductory statement prior to the hearing, they were asked by the distinguished chairman of the Education Subcommittee (Mr. PELL) about the bill. They responded immediately and enthusiastically in support of S. 2625.

As Senators will see, Mr. Megal, in a letter written the following day, expressed concern that I failed to mention AFT in my introductory floor statement. I indicated to Mr. Megal that, for the most part, the organizations and individuals quoted were those who had previously testified. I, of course, am aware of AFT's interest and involvement in education and I am very grateful for their endorsement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Megal's letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

JULY 16, 1969.

Hon. GEORGE MURPHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This morning as President Selden and I testified in support of the student teacher corps legislation, Senator Pell handed us a copy of your news release of July 15, 1969. This release concerned the bill you plan to introduce titled, the Urban and Rural Education Act of 1969.

We commend you for introducing this much needed and excellent piece of legislation. The American Federation of Teachers wholeheartedly supports the ideals which you propose.

Please, therefore, consider this a request to be permitted to testify in support of the legislation during hearings on the bill. In reading the news release we are impressed by the number of educational organizations which you list who intend to support your proposals.

We are equally disturbed, however, that the AFT was not among your listing. Our President, David Selden, is a member of the Urban Planning Commission. So many of the ideals which you inaugurated received his support and approval. To acquaint you further and with the thought that the information might be of help to the Committee as it considers the legislation, I am enclosing copies of President Selden's articles entitled, "Educational Need," and, "Compensatory Education," which appeared in the American Teachers under dates of June and May respectively.

Again, my commendation.

Sincerely,

CARL J. MEGEL,
Director of Legislation.

EXPORT CONTROLS NEEDED ON WALNUT LOGS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a description of an industry problem which I have been concerned with since 1961 and which has steadily worsened. The American Walnut Manufacturers Association and the Fine Hardwoods Association jointly filed with the Secretary of Commerce a petition on February 26, 1969, to reimpose export controls on walnut logs to prevent this ruinous depletion of America's greatest hardwood, American black walnut, under the present policy of unrestricted log exports.

In 1964 I was able to convince then Secretary Hodges of the critical situation of the raw material supply of this great American hardwood and he saw fit to impose an export quota to the foreign nations who were harvesting this timber. Likewise at the same time, the domestic industry volunteered at the instruction of the Department of Commerce to conserve its own consumption by changing the standard thickness of walnut veneer from one twenty-eighths inch to one thirty-sixth inch dry measure.

Unfortunately, this program was not allowed to continue by the new Secretary, John T. Connor. Had it been allowed to continue, the growth rate versus the consumption rate, according to the Business and Defense Services Administration division of Commerce, would have been back in balance by 1970. Instead, Secretary Connor removed this control program which had had only 9 calendar months to exist on February 13, 1965. Since then, the situation has reached an alltime record high of walnut log exports in 1968 of 21,896,000 board feet while domestic consumption has dropped to 14,308,000 board feet as compared to 20,000,000 board feet in 1963.

The Commerce Department promised prompt action when the Fine Hardwoods and American Walnut Association resubmitted their petition February 26, 1969. In the meantime, there has been little or no action and yet the exports of walnut logs each day is exceeding the recordbreaking pace of 1968.

I ask unanimous consent that an article on this subject published in the Wall Street Journal of July 14, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

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

WALNUT LOG PRICES ARE CLIMBING TO RECORDS AS EXPORTS CUT INTO DOMESTIC USERS' NEEDS

(By Norman H. Fischer)

CHICAGO.—Walnut log prices are climbing to record heights as foreign and domestic buyers compete for supplies to meet demand for furniture and other wood products.

The big demand bulge has more than doubled prices of the dark, rich wood in the past five years. The Government says prices for prime walnut logs, 24 inches to 28 inches in diameter, climbed last year to $1,367 per 1,000 board feet in Southern Indiana from $770 in 1963. Lumbermen in the Midwestern black walnut belt say prices have jumped further this year.

These climbing prices already have pushed up costs for many domestic processors, and the industry is calling for restoration of export quotas to curb demand. Meanwhile, the higher prices have triggered an increasing rate of tree thievery.

As far as domestic walnut users see it, exports to France, Switzerland, West Germany, Italy and Japan are the main cause of the walnut price boom. "Foreign buyers have been scrounging through the black walnut belt buying up all the best quality logs they can put their hands on," says an official of an Edinburg, Ind., veneer maker. "They're willing to pay," he adds.

U.S. exports of walnut logs last year measured out at 22 million board feet, a third more than in 1967 and 75% more than two years ago. The exports, representing the largest outflow of walnut logs in any one year, exceed domestic consumption for the second consecutive year.

STYLE CUTS DOMESTIC USE

Domestic use of walnut logs dropped slightly last year to 14.3 million board feet, the lowest in a decade. U.S. consumption five years ago was 20.7 million board feet. The recent trend in furniture to Mediterranean-Spanish styles, which use heavier and coarser grain woods such as pecan and oak, accounts for much of the decline, along with higher walnut prices.

In spite of the reduced domestic needs, walnut continues to be the most used hardwood in furniture. And, there are signs that U.S. furniture fashions are turning a little more to increased use of walnut. Meanwhile, it is the leading wood in European furniture styling. Even at current high prices there continues to be a steady overseas demand for U.S. walnut logs.

Several domestic walnut processors say they're unable to compete with the foreign buyers. The exporters are paying premiums for, and getting, the best-quality logs. That leaves U.S. processors with more and more medium and lower-grade logs, many of which normally can't be used for furniture veneer. To remove defects and get acceptable wood from low-quality walnut, processors are cutting away more of each log, thus increasing their costs.

EXPORTED WALNUT RETURNS

Because of higher labor costs, the American woodworking industry is geared to high-speed operations, including sanding operations. As a result, veneer can't be cut much thinner than 1-36 of an inch in dry thickness or the powered sanders would grind through it. In contrast, Europeans and Japanese employ low-cost labor to sand veneer by hand, so they cut veneer to 1-50 of an inch or less and thus get more from each log.

Some of the walnut logs exported to Japan come back as facing on plywood for such uses as cabinets and bookcases. Some of the Japanese veneer on plywood is cut as thin as 1/100 of an inch, U.S. veneer makers claim. "It's so thin you can almost see through it," says E. Howard Gatewood, executive vice president of the Fine Hardwoods Association.

The imported veneered plywood "is beating the hell out of us," says George Wilhelm, president of Bacon Veneer Co., Chicago. He claims it is being sold at prices ranging from 50% to 70% "of what we must get for our product." What's worse, he says, he can't get enough quality walnut logs to meet the demand from furniture makers. "We have sufficient demand to keep two shifts operating," he says, "but for the past year we've been lucky to get enough logs to keep one shift going."

For such reasons as these, says Don Gott, executive director of the American Walnut Manufactures Association, "it is vital that the Government takes action to slow heavy walnut log exports." His group and the Fine Hardwoods Association have jointly petitioned the Government to reimpose export controls on walnut logs (controls were removed in 1965). No decision has been reached yet.

Meanwhile, "We are having an epidemic of timber rustling," complains Howard M. Utter, president of Pike Lumber Co., Akron, Ind. Hardwood tree thievery has occurred in scattered areas throughout the Midwest. Usually the rustlers operate in unpopulated areas, but a few months ago a big walnut tree was stolen from a tract just 30 miles west of Chicago, owned by an assistant vice president of First National Bank of Chicago.

POACHERS' TACTICS

Hardwood dealers say poachers case the countryside for potential targets, and return later with trucks to make their haul. With modern chain saws and other equipment a tree can be felled and sawed into logs within a few minutes. Many of the pilfered logs are stored for short periods, it's believed, and then moved into the export market.

Walnut tree owners are doing what they can to slow the tree thievery. John I. Shafer Hardwood Co., Logansport, Ind., had four of its walnut trees, valued at $2,500, swiped last year. The firm then sold other trees it owned that were vulnerably located near roads and dug large trenches around those remaining to prevent trucks from getting close to them.

Lumbermen say it's very difficult to catch thieves in the act of stealing a walnut tree, and next to impossible to prove any logs have been stolen, because they must be matched with tree stumps for positive identification. The lack of convictions also hasn't helped reduce rustling activities, tree owners complain.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S DRAFT POLICY

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, today President Nixon announced that because of Vietnam troop withdrawals, he is suspending draft calls for November and December of this year. He also repeated his call for congressional action on draft reform, and served notice that if Congress did not live up to its responsibility in this vital area, he would take action to reform the draft via Executive order.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, and as one long interested in draft reform, I want to commend the President for taking this worthwhile initiative, both in lowering draft calls and bringing about draft reform, and I want to add my voice again to the call for congressional activity.

In the President's message to Congress on draft reform of May 13, 1969, he endorsed the principles of "youngest first" selection, 1-year eligibility for all registrants, and a lottery system.

While the President can designate 19 years as the prime age group for draft calls by Executive order, this raises the possibility of the inequitable situation that college students currently deferred, and young men over 20, would be totally exempt from the draft.

Legislation embodying the President's proposal, S. 2843, would allow for all of these young men to be placed in the 1-year eligible pool, so that they would have an equal chance to be drafted along with 19-year-olds. This is a positive proposal which would go a long way toward making draft selection more equitable.

However, there is nothing the President can do about effectuating a random selection system because of section 5(a) of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, which specifically prohibits any change in the order of selection within any age group, other than the oldest first by date of birth system, in effect at the time of the enactment of that act.

S. 2843 provides for the repeal of this prohibitory language, thereby allowing the President to implement the random birthday method he outlined in his May 13 message.

Mr. President, all of these ideas: 1-year eligibility, youngest first, and random selection, are essential if we are going to have an equitable draft system. Many of us wanted to implement these proposals in 1967, when the existing draft law was about to expire, but we ended up merely reenacting the same system which had been in effect since World War II began.

We now have an outstanding opportunity, in conjunction with the withdrawal of American troops from the Vietnam war, and hopefully corresponding reductions of overall American troop levels, to bring about meaningful revisions of the draft system.

The President has put the leadership of the White House squarely behind these revisions, and now it is up to Congress to follow this leadership.

The necessity for this action comes at a time when many are concerned by the attitudes of our young men and women toward our Government, and toward many of our institutions. There has been much unrest on our campuses, and unfortunately, a number of outbreaks of violence. Our young people are restless, and do not think their Government leaders are being responsive to many of the urgent problems we face today.

Young people are particularly concerned with our military policies, especially the Vietnam war, and there is no governmental institution which affects them, and their lives, more directly than the draft.

The President's action today can go a long way toward demonstrating to these young people his administration's concern with the current draft system, and his genuine interest in making it more equitable. But he needs congressional help to carry out these intentions. He needs the support of members of both parties in Congress to insure that we have the strongest possible draft reform.

I was privileged to have the bipartisan support of 12 Senators who are cospon-

soring my own draft reform bill, S. 1433, and thus know first-hand that this interest in draft reform goes beyond party lines.

My bill includes the President's recommendations, but also calls for binding national standards, to be applied equally by all local draft boards, for deferments and exemptions, for a national manpower pool, which would eliminate the inequities in draft selection existing by virtue of geographical differences of the local boards, and for a 6-year term for the Director of the National Selective Service System.

I strongly believe in all these reforms, and hope to see them all enacted. But at the present time, I am lending my full support to immediate attention to the President's reforms.

The President is taking major steps, and I strongly urge all my colleagues to give serious attention and thought to the need for these reforms, to consider the national effect if we merely continue the inequitable draft system we are now using, and to help pave the way for immediate consideration and passage of the President's proposals.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR EAGLETON

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on Saturday, August 30, 1969, the distinguished Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON) addressed the Indiana Democratic Editorial Association at French Lick, Ind. His excellent address will, I think, help us realize what our problems really are in this country and what our priorities should be. As Senator EAGLETON said:

> Something is wrong when our budget for ammunition alone in Vietnam last year equaled our entire Federal budget for education here at home.

I believe Senators will be interested in reading Senator EAGLETON's speech in its entirety 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:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR THOMAS F. EAGLETON TO INDIANA DEMOCRATIC EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION, FRENCH LICK, IND., AUGUST 30, 1969

The temptation for a Democrat to entertain a Democratic audience by taking pot shots at a Republican Administration is substantial.

There are plenty of good targets: the highest rate of inflation since the last Republican Administration in the early 1950's . . . contrasted with Candidate Nixon's promise to control it; personnel policies that put the AMA in charge of picking the Nation's health chief . . . and the drug industry in charge of naming the top drug evaluator; that dinner in Los Angeles you know, the one most of us paid for and didn't get invited to.

There is the new San Clemente style of national leadership, which is really based on the traditional Republican leadership principle identified by Adlai Stevenson: "Don't just do something, sit there." Unfortunately, if you're a housewife spending more and more of the family budget on inflation . . . or a poor man looking for a job . . . or a principal trying to educate more children for less money . . . or a mother with a son in Vietnam . . . leaders who just sit there are not good enough.

It is well to remember, however, that we Democrats lost the White House last year partly because of our own failures of leadership—because of a disastrous war we couldn't end, and because of the inflation it caused. We lost it partly because our message to the American people was not relevant enough. We lost it partly because our party was in disarray.

This doesn't mean we should humbly neglect our obligation to criticize the Republican Administration, and the solace it provides. After all, they promised to solve some admittedly difficult problems and thus far they haven't delivered.

But the fact remains that we Democrats need some better answers and a better record than we had last year when we go to the people in 1970 or 1972. And you can't build a record on criticism alone.

We are off to a good start on record-building with the tax reform legislation now before the Senate.

It was the Democrats in Congress who forced Mr. Nixon to accept tax reform in order to extend the surtax—a surtax he had promised during the campaign to end.

I predict that a Democratic Congress will pass the most sweeping tax reform this country has known in 15 years.

Tax reform is necessary. It is overdue. It is right. And the Democrats will earn—and deserve—credit for it from the average working men and their families who constitute the traditional backbone of the Democratic Party.

Then there are some traditional Democratic issues which need to be taken to the people with a new and bold perspective—issues which matter greatly to the average American family . . . issues on which Democrats have always led . . . and on which the Republicans have always dragged their feet.

Take health, for example. There *is* a difference between the Party of Medicare and the Party of the AMA.

A million Americans die every year from heart disease. But the Republican Administration has recommended a $6 million reduction in the budget for the National Heart Institute.

Cancer kills one American man, woman, or child every two minutes. The Republican Administration has proposed a cut of $5 million for the National Cancer Institute.

When this great nation ranks 17th in the world in infant mortality . . . when we are a dismal 21st in life expectancy for males and 12th for females . . . when two-thirds of the actual cost of health care in America is uninsured and 30 million Americans have no health insurance at all . . . you can be sure that millions and millions of Americans have known the tragedy of unnecessary and preventable illness in their own families.

You can be sure they are looking for answers, and will respond to the Party that offers them.

So too will the more than 20 million senior citizens. Three out of ten Americans over 65 find they have earned a life of poverty after a lifetime of work—an annual income below $1,975

These retirees find that fixed incomes and lifetime savings are totally inadequate in today's inflationary economy.

They have a right to expect a full measure of financial justice, and the Party that brought them Social Security and Medicare should be the one to give it to them.

There is also the issue of education.

President Nixon, who last year at this time was promising that his Administration would be "second to none in education, promptly cut almost half a billion dollars out of the education budget for fiscal 1970.

Nearly two centuries ago, when our nation was very young and not very rich, George Washington said:

"In a country like this . . . if there cannot be money found to answer the common purposes of education, there is something amiss in the ruling political power."

There is not a major city in America today where the common purposes of education by modern standards are being truly realized for the average child.

At a time when every parent knows that education is the first rung on the ladder to success for his child . . . and when every local taxpayer knows that the cost of education is nearly insupportable, American parents will respond, I believe, to the Party which offers them a realistic blueprint of excellent education for their child and every child.

But we can never adequately educate and care for ourselves and our children—we can never fulfill the humane promise of our free and prosperous society—until we address ourselves to the fundamental problem of rectifying national priorities.

Something is wrong when our budget for ammunition alone in Vietnam last year equaled our entire federal budget for education here at home.

Something is wrong when we spend $21,600 for each enemy soldier we hope to kill in South Vietnam, and 44 federal dollars for each American primary and secondary pupil we hope to educate here at home.

These *are* our national priorities today. They have not been changed. This is the most unforgivable failure of the Nixon Administration and the greatest opportunity for the Democratic party.

It does no good to play games about responsibility for Vietnam, or to trace once more the tragic sequence of accidents and blunders which brought us to our present position in Southeast Asia. Surely Mr. Nixon was not responsible until January 20, 1969.

But he sought and won responsibility for the war in Vietnam with a promise of new leadership to end the war and win peace in the Pacific.

Where is that leadership now? Where are the new initiatives for peace? What has changed? Like all new Presidents, Mr. Nixon had a chance to change outworn, discredited policies to which he personally had no commitment. But he hasn't.

Two and a half months ago the President announced his intention to withdraw 25,000 troops, with the strong and repeated implication that more would follow. As of today, only 11,000 have been withdrawn, and on top of that comes the announcement that a further decision on troop withdrawals will be postponed indefinitely.

In Saigon, the Thieu-Ky regime still enjoys our unwavering support. It has not broadened its base. Indeed just last week Premier Huong, a moderate civilian with some support among the people, was thrown out of the government and replaced by a four star general who is a close supporter of President Thieu.

The jails are still full of neutralists and others whose participation will be necessary in government capable of standing on its own feet in South Vietnam.

Averell Harriman, one of our most distinguished diplomats, a man personally familiar with the Paris negotiations, has said, "It is absolutely vital that the President of the United States take the lead in ending the fighting, the killing." But the President of the United States has taken no lead. Since the Nixon Administration took office, there have been approximately 60,000 additional casualties, and today the killing continues. The talks remain on dead center.

But it is not only Vietnam that distorts our national priorities. For years we have watched the military budget escalate as the Pentagon and its suppliers have sold the American public new and costly pawns in a macabre game of overkill. The futile objectives of winning the arms race has continually received more attention than efforts to control it.

Who is responsible? We all are.

But once again, President Nixon sought and won responsibility for beginning arms control negotiation . . . to "bring us from an era of confrontation to one of negotiation." And yet, a year after arms control talks were to be started they still have not begun.

President Nixon came into office with the chance for a fresh start in arms control. He made his start by demanding construction of a new multi-billion dollar anti-ballistic missile system which will add yet another turn to the arms spiral without increasing our security. Testing continues on the MIRV (multiple independently targeted re-entry vehicles), the deadly missile hydra which threatens to push the arms race once and for all beyond the point where talks can control it.

The fact that the Secretary of Defense has grudgingly responded to Congressional pressure by cutting projected military spending for next year by $3 billion is welcome. But it is only a slight constriction of the old priorities, not an assertion of the new.

Yes, we must spend every penny we actually need for defense, but we cannot expect to make our nation what it ought to be with small handouts from the Pentagon.

Today we can ask no more of the American taxpayers.

The President's Urban Affairs Council tells us candidly that even after the Vietnam war has ended we can expect very few additional resources.

So the hard fact is that we must now make responsible and courageous choices between guns and butter. This will be the great test of American statesmanship in the 1970's.

I believe the Democratic Party—in power or out—can and must be the party that leads America in making these choices.

EULOGY OF SENATOR EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, one of the most concise, yet eloquent, tributes I have yet seen to the late Senator Dirksen, came in an editorial from the San Diego Union on September 9, 1969. I ask unanimous consent that this expressive eulogy be printed in the RECORD.

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

A SERVANT OF GOD AND COUNTRY: DIRKSEN MADE SIMPLICITY GREAT

"In God We Trust."

The phrase was more than a motto to Sen. Everett McKinley Dirksen.

It was a way of life.

Since his death Sunday afternoon, there have been many eulogies and many reminiscences. Not a few have lamented the passing of the Senate's great orator of the old eloquent tradition.

We shared the joy of Senator Dirksen's resonant speeches.

But the senior senator from Illinois must be remembered for more than a great oratorical style.

Here was a man who believed fiercely in the basic difference between right and wrong.

Everett McKinley Dirksen was a broad man, one whose priorities were simple. He gave his first allegiance to God, his second to the United States of America, his third to his family, his fourth to the Republican Party.

Without Senator Dirksen, President Kennedy would not have had the nuclear test ban treaty which is regarded as his tallest monument.

Mr. Dirksen's reasoning was simple:

"I should not like to have written on my tombstone, 'He knew what happened at Hiroshima, but he did not take the first step.'"

Without Senator Dirksen, President Johnson would not have had the civil rights legislation that he considers his greatest contribution to the nation.

Without Senator Dirksen, President Eisenhower's programs would have been emasculated in his last two years in office by a high-riding, newly-elected Democratic majority.

Without Senator Dirksen, President Nixon probably would not have won Senate approval of the Safeguard antiballistic missile system. Without Senator Dirksen, Mr. Nixon now faces trying days on Capitol Hill. No one since Sen. Robert A. Taft better deserved the title of "Mr. Republican."

It is hard to forget how he stood staunchly alongside President Johnson in the trying ordeal of Vietnam, privately leaning toward a "victory" policy, but publicly supporting the chief executive on what to Dirksen were the best of all grounds:

"Because he is my President . . ."

Senator Dirksen died without satisfying one of his fiercest convictions—the restoration of prayer to public schools.

In Mr. Dirksen's view, the Supreme Court decisions outlawing school prayer had taken something basic away from America.

His memory could be served in no better way than to hasten passage of a constitutional amendment that puts prayer back in the classroom and reasserts the nation's faith in the words Everett McKinley Dirksen lived by:

"In God We Trust."

JOBS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the National Alliance of Businessmen was founded under the sponsorship of President Lyndon B. Johnson in January of 1968. Its initial goal was to provide, over a 3-year period, 500,000 jobs for the disadvantaged poor in our urban centers. As of August 15, NAB has placed 229,679 poor Americans in meaningful jobs. This placement reflects job pledges to the tune of 312,537.

However, more important than statistics alone, the Alliance, under the chairmanship of Donald M. Kendall, and the executive direction of its president, Paul W. Kayser, has engaged the active support and involvement in the problems of the hard core of over 20,000 American business firms. This evidence of interest on the part of the American business community in the problems of the less fortunate, indicates a growing development of social consciousness in an important sector of American life. This, Mr. President, is a development I highly applaud.

Recently, Mr. Kayser spoke to the National Directors Workshop of the U.S. Jaycees in Tulsa, Okla., on July 21, 1969. I ask unanimous consent his speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF PAUL W. KAYSER, PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF BUSINESSMEN, TO THE NATIONAL DIRECTORS WORKSHOP OF THE JAYCEES, TULSA, OKLA., JULY 21, 1969

Gentlemen, I want to thank you very much for inviting me to be here, and for the opportunity to speak to you about a matter that is of extreme importance to me—and I believe to all of us.

The Jaycees and the National Alliance of Businessmen have a great deal in common. We are voluntary organizations based on the idea that the best way to solve problems is through the energy and know-how of private citizens and organizations. We believe that Americans are willing to pitch in and work for a good end—once they see a sensible action-oriented way that gets results. And we believe that this will be a better, stronger country when more Americans work to solve problems through their own efforts—rather than turning all the big problems over to government—and then cussing about an expanding government bureaucracy.

I'd like to tell you today about the National Alliance of Businessmen and what NAB is doing to help solve a major national problem—hard-core unemployment. And then I'd like to ask for your help—because I think the NAB program fits in perfectly with the goals of the Jaycees "Operation Opportunity," and because the Jaycees are the kind of people we need to strengthen our forces in many of our 125 metropolitan areas.

First, let's look for a minute at the problem the National Alliance of Businessmen is trying to solve. Then, I'd like to tell you more about NAB and exactly how it is going about its task.

The basic problem we are dealing with at NAB—and in the program we call JOBS, for Job Opportunities in the Business Sector—is the existence of unemployment in the midst of a highly productive, affluent economy—and in the midst of unfilled demand for workers.

I don't need to cite the figures on the number of people who live below the level of poverty—trying to feed a family of four on less than $3,300 a year. But we all know that in an era of unparalleled success, some of our people have been left out. Many of them are black, but not all—many are white, others are Mexican American and American Indian. They are both urban and rural—and many are new urban residents who have moved from rural areas, such as Appalachia and the farms, since the end of World War II.

Why can't these people find and keep jobs?

There are a number of reasons. One is an inadequate education that left them without skills and barely able to read or write. Another is the inadequate diet which drains them of health and energy. A third is a syndrome of failure which destroys their faith in themselves and convinces them they're not wanted in the society of people who make decent money for a day's work.

The best description I have seen of what poverty is all about was written by John Gage, who has worked with the poor for the American Public Welfare Association. I quote Mr. Gage:

"Poverty is never having enough. Poverty is always running out of money—of food—of clothes—of fuel—of soap—of bedding—of equipment—of furnishings—of room—of time—of any way to go any place—of anything to do anything with—of any way for the family to stay together and live.

"Poverty is never having hope of having enough.

"Poverty is always knowing that there is no way to get ahead—no way to save up in order to later 'have'; always knowing that what little you have is wearing out—being used up—going downhill; always knowing that 'getting by'—eating some—keeping covered and as clean as you can—is the best you can ever do.

"Poverty is always trying to express—trying to be heard—trying to communicate. Being insulted—ignored—belittled—criticized—talked down to—being unable to show or demonstrate.

"Poverty is never having joy or peace. Poverty is always fear—fear of the landlord—the welfare—the police—the storekeeper—the 'sometime' boss. It is always grief—for the man that is gone. For the

woman you can't be with—the children you can't do for—or enjoy—or be with.

"Poverty is never feeling that you are a part of the rest of the world—never being informed—never understanding.

"Poverty is always being uneducated—untrained—half-equipped—always being told you're dumb—ignorant—can't understand.

"Poverty is never feeling dignity—or self-esteem.

"Poverty is never being able to plan—never being able to see a way to do better.

"Poverty is always receiving too little to 'catch up'—seeing your children sifted out and forced out. It is always hope being shattered. It is always listening to 'big talk' by 'big people.' It is always broken promises. It is always rising a bit—and being crushed down again.

"Poverty is always being considered a crook—an immoral person—a deadbeat—a malingerer—a parasite—a 'no good.'

"Poverty is never fully living—always being just half alive. Half alive—without the prospect of hope."

I quote this not primarily because it illustrates the misery of poverty, but because it shows the spirit of hopelessness, of failure, of lack of dignity, which makes it so hard for anyone ever brought up in poverty to break out of it, without a special opportunity and a little extra help.

What can we who live in a different world, a different part of America, do for these people? What can business do, and young community leaders like yourselves?

Everyone agrees that welfare is not the answer. Welfare destroys dignity and makes it all the more likely that children brought up in these families will soon acquire the same patterns of hopelessness and defeatism as their parents—except that the young, with their resentment, are the ones most likely to turn to crime and to violence.

And welfare as it is set up today even contributes to the problem—by driving unemployed or under-employed poor fathers out of the home, so that the mothers and children can get welfare assistance. And by making it that if someone in a family on welfare gets a minimum wage level job, that family loses *all* its welfare payments—and may have less money to live on than before, particularly if there are a lot of kids to feed.

No one argues with the fact that welfare is not the answer to the problem. Everyone agree that the answer is jobs—meaningful, permanent jobs with a chance for advancement. The government agrees that the answer is jobs—not welfare—and they have turned to us in the private sector for our help.

Six out of every seven jobs in our country are in the private sector of our economy. We businessmen are the ones who have the jobs. We are also the ones who best know what a worker needs to learn to do on a job. If we can place the unemployed and the under-employed in meaningful jobs, teach them how to do these jobs, and keep them employed, we will have made a major inroad on poverty in our nation.

Bringing these people into the mainstream of our economy is not just humanitarianism. It pays off in dollars and cents—for the company, which gains a worker, for the government, which saves welfare and gains a taxpayer, and for our country.

I say this because the events of the last several years have made it evident that we're not likely to have a peaceful country until the men and women who have been left out can find the help they need to hold a job and improve their lives. To this extent, the choice between a peaceful nation and one perpetually in danger of major disruptions belongs to you and me—to the businessmen and other private employers of America.

Next, let me look at the National Alliance of Businessmen and what we are trying to do about this situation.

The National Alliance of Businessmen received its charter in the President's Manpower Message to Congress on January 23, 1968.

I think the title of that message is an important one: "To earn a living: the right of every American."

In that message, the President outlined our task and declared: "This is a tall order for American business. But the history of American business is the history of triumph over challenge."

The motto of the JOBS program is "Hire-Train-Retain."

Most programs to help the hard-core unemployed in the past have focused on "employability." They have attempted to bring the unemployed up to a level of education and skill that would enable them to then go out and find jobs. These programs have had only limited success. Too often, their graduates have still lacked the specific vocational skills they would need for the specific jobs available to them. Or else, potential employers have simply lacked confidence in the men and women referred to them from these programs.

The JOBS program of the National Alliance of Businessmen operates on a "hire-first" principle. An individual business or private non-profit organization agrees to hire a certain number of unemployed or under-employed men or women for jobs in its plants or offices. Candidates are referred to the employer by the state employment service or by the local office of the Department of Labor. The employer then hires the men or women he chooses, and is responsible for providing them with the training, counseling or other special services that will help them become productive workers and remain on the job.

Businessmen run the program. The national office and local offices are staffed principally by the businessmen on loan from their companies. Other executives on loan from their companies make up the majority of the job solicitors—the businessmen who call on companies in their area to ask for job pledges for the unemployed. It is up to the company doing the hiring—with help from us and from the local NAB office—to provide the training and other special help that will will keep the new employee on the job.

Government contracts are available to reimburse employers for the extraordinary costs of hiring and training the hard-core unemployed. These contracts enable many smaller companies to join the JOBS program, and help even the largest companies to make the full commitment of resources and management skill needed for a successful training program.

The average cost of training a new worker under a JOBS contract with the Department of Labor is $2,900. We estimate that on the average, each new employee hired under this program relieves the government of welfare and unemployment costs of about $1,350 a year. He will also pay federal income and state sales tax of about $270 a year—for a total gain to the government of $1,620. This means that the government's total investment in training every new employee who succeeds in the JOBS program is paid off in less than two years.

As of last month—the end of its first full year—NAB had helped in the hiring and training of a total of 175,000 workers. Of these, 107,000 were still on the job. This means that the turnover rate for these workers whom many thought could never be brought into the mainstream of American production is not much higher than the turnover rate American industry normally experiences with new workers.

I think it is significant that one of President Nixon's first acts was to pledge his Administration's "complete and unqualified support" to the JOBS Program. At his urging, the program has been expanded from the initial 50 cities to 125 metropolitan areas, and the goal for workers hired, trained, and on the job by June 1971, has been raised to 614,000.

The Nixon Administration has backed up this pledge with the fullest cooperation of the Department of Labor—and it has requested that the Congress greatly increase the funds available to repay business for the added costs of hiring, training, upgrading, and retaining the hard-core unemployed and subemployed on the job.

I want to emphasize that making a training program for the hard-core or disadvantaged unemployed work is not easy. It requires a real commitment that is carried out by middle managers, personnel officers, and frontline supervisors throughout the company.

It is extremely important that younger executives and middle management understand our program, because they are often the ones who make it work or fail in a company. Many of you are in a position to help influence basic business attitudes toward hiring and training of the hard-core unemployed—and I hope you will take every opportunity to tell the younger executives and business leaders of your cities what we are doing and how important it is.

When we ask a businessman to join us in this program, we don't want him to undertake this task under any illusions. We have to be realisic about the difficulties as well as about the opportunities. This is not an ordinary industry hiring program. If any businessman thinks he is going to do his part by simply hiring someone sent to him through a government recruitment program, and then shrug his shoulders when that man doesn't show up the next day or week, then he's kidding himself.

He not only doesn't realize what the problems are, but he's piling another load of failure on the very person he's supposed to be helping. If that's what happens, then the business community is bound to become part of the problem rather than being part of the solution.

We don't intend to see that happen. I don't think any one of you, as businessmen and citizens of American cities, can afford to let that happen either. The stakes are too great—for us, for the community, for the nation, and most of all for the disadvantaged.

We have to think in terms of entirely remolding our hiring processes, our personnel and supervisory methods. Quite bluntly, the JOBS program means taking on people we wouldn't even have let pass the plant gatekeepers in the past. We've got to look beneath prison records, lack of education, lack of steady employment in the past, a poor health record. Instead of screening out people our tests and records define as "undesirables" or "misfits," we've got to start seeking and screening in untapped and overlooked potential. The plain fact is that we have to switch from a criterion of qualification to a criterion of need and of long-range potential. This is not easy. But we've got to hit hardest where the problem is the toughest.

Consider the profile of the average hard-core trainee. He has had no regular work for 18 months. He has never received any real training. His parents were unskilled. He probably needs eye glasses and dental care, but has seldom—if ever—been to a doctor. He often has a wife and several children. On the average, he has a sixth grade education—and has spent at least 30 days of his life in jail.

Let me give you some idea of what's involved. And what can be the results if we go about it right . . .

Recently, Under Secretary of Labor James Hodgson spoke to a NAB dinner in Washington and gave an example which I think is worth repeating.

He told of a businessman and a hard-core trainee in a large eastern city, and in a well-known corporation. The businessman was

about 40, and already high up in the organization. He decided to try the personal approach, so a NAB metro official put him in touch with a 25 year old unemployed person, married and living in the slum area. The businessman asked his secretary to call the man so they could have a chat about the latter's possible employment with the company.

Of course, the man had no phone. This was the executive's first lesson. So, in the afternoon, he left work early and went to the slum to visit the man in his home.

He was met with considerable mistrust—but he didn't back off, and in a couple hours, had won some of the man's confidence. They talked about everything. This was the first time a non-poor man had ever been in the house and the poor man was taking advantage of it.

Finally, the businessman asked the other man if he would like to train for a job in his company. The answer was "Sure." So the businessman laid out the details about reporting for work the next Monday and said, "See you then." The reply was, "Sure."

Well, the man didn't show up on Monday—nor Tuesday. On Wednesday, the businessman went to the man's house again for another talk.

This time the man confessed he simply had been frightened about going downtown into the company's shining, imposing new building. He was afraid he wouldn't even get past the guard. So the businessman said he'd come by the next morning and pick the man up, which he did. There was no trouble with the guard, of course.

At lunchtime, the two went to a moderately priced restaurant. The businessman ordered lunch, but the poor man said he wanted nothing. He seemed to doubt that the management of the restaurant would serve him. So the businessman ordered for the two of them.

Well, often in the next few weeks they went back to the restaurant for lunch. And one day, the trainee asked a wistful question: "Do you suppose if I wore a shirt and tie I could bring my wife into this place some evening?"

The further chapter of this story is that the trainee is a full-time employee of the company, has been on the job for almost a year and has moved out of his one-room slum apartment. He has had a couple of raises, is seldom late for work, and often goes back to that restaurant and sometimes takes his wife there for dinner.

I like this story because it shows how this man—with personal help and attention of the simplest kind—not only acquired a job, but he acquired dignity. Dignity wasn't given to him. He acquired it. Not without some help, but he acquired it.

That's what the JOBS program is all about.

In addition to the basic JOBS program, there is also an added responsibility that the Alliance assumes during the summer months. This is our responsibility to the youth of America, the generation now coming up.

As you all know, a special situation exists in the summertime. It is then that the youth, who make up almost half of the hard-core unemployed, come out of school and onto the streets. Many of those youngsters are from the disadvantaged families we already seek to help.

And confronting them is the prospect of an idle, frustrating, restless summer. Many of them, through utter discouragement and failure to find a job may turn to crime. And I don't have to tell you that crime in the streets—where these children may turn—is one of our nation's greatest problems. Many of those kids won't go back to school, because the money isn't there. And that, unfortunately, may be their first step toward joining the "pushed out" society.

Even one generation of hard-core poor and unemployed at this time in our nation's history is too much. We simply cannot afford the inhuman waste of seeing another start breeding before our eyes.

We need jobs for these kids. Jobs which will put a buck in their pockets to enable them to return to school—give them some understanding of the free enterprise system—and make them feel there is opportunity.

Mr. Richard Hatcher, the Negro Mayor of Gary, Indiana, gave us a warning recently which I think we should take very seriously. At our NAB Kickoff dinner he told us—and I quote him—"This can't be operation 'cool it' for the summer. We've got to humanize this program."

I thoroughly agree with Mr. Hatcher.

The NAB's summer youth program is a chance to salvage a human being—before he gets shoved onto the scrap heap and into a blighted life.

Lord knows, the youth of America is in a rebellious mood at all ages and economic levels—for what precise reasons I don't pretend to know. But I think we better start trying to find answers. I think these kids can be reached—and talked to.

I think the eyes of a great many people are on the business community today, as never before. They want to see, at this time of crisis in America's history, just how we measure up. I spoke a moment ago of the rebelliousness of youth. Youth is always idealistic, and that's as it should be. But this generation of youth on campus is more outspokenly idealistic than any in a long time.

And what they see in American business these days doesn't match the human values they want to see society meet. We are, they say, too concerned with profits and not enough with human beings. That's why it's so hard for corporations to recruit on campuses these days.

Whether you agree or not, we've been measured by these young people—and have been found wanting in our social responsibilities.

Their disapproval doesn't limit itself to their father's generation. It includes you as well—their older brothers.

And yet, this young generation of twenty year olds represents the future of America. We must be committed to them—and that we're 30 or over doesn't lessen that fact. It's time we showed them—and the rest of America—that business can rise to the challenge, and that we can be *their* hope and salvation.

Now, what can each of you do to help the National Alliance of Businessmen reach its goals? How can the Jaycees help us to bring the "pushed-out" back into our economy and to prove that private citizens and private employers can take the lead in making America a place where every man and woman able to work knows the dignity of a meaningful job?

As I mentioned earlier, the success of the JOBS program depends very much on the attitudes of younger executives and middle management. Top management can only set the basic company commitment. It's the frontline supervisors and younger executives who are in a position to communicate with these new employees on a day-to-day basis, understand their problems in the new environment of the plant or office, and make sure they have the help they need to succeed. Jaycees who understand the JOBS program can have an immense influence, both in their own companies and throughout their communities.

But communicating with other young business leaders about JOBS is only part of what Jaycees could do for NAB. We need the Jaycees as the arms, legs, eyes, and ears of our 125 metro offices. My hope—and my suggestion—is that NAB programs should be made an integral part of the Jaycees' "Operation Opportunity" all through the United States.

We need the Jaycees most of all to help us call on employers for job pledges—pledges for entry-level permanent jobs and for summer jobs for youth.

In every company the JOBS program begins with a very small event—two men talking. One of these men is the president or chief operating executive of the company. The other is a man from NAB—usually a businessman on loan from his own company to call on employers for NAB.

The NAB man explains the JOBS program—explains why it is critical to our country and to the private enterprise system that business hire and train the unemployed. He tells what other companies have done and how the JOBS program has worked out for them. And he asks the company man to hire a certain number of the unemployed through the local NAB office.

The Jaycees are already working with the local NAB office in some of our cities. In Atlanta 25 Jaycees have been calling on employers for the last several months. Each Jaycee has eight target companies, and so far the 25 Jaycees have received about 175 pledges for basic jobs.

Most of these companies were employers NAB wouldn't have been able to reach without the extra help of the Jaycees. So these 25 Jaycees—and they are just beginning—have already made a real impact in Atlanta. As they follow up on their original calls on their target companies, and as hiring and training begin in the new companies which have pledged to hire the unemployed, the impact of the Jaycees work will multiply throughout Atlanta.

We also need help in the summer jobs program. It's already too late to pitch in effectively this year. But next spring will soon be here. For summer jobs even more than basic jobs, a successful campaign depends on contacting every potential employer in town. Even the retail store with only five or ten employees is a potential summer employer. Some of the canvassing for summer jobs can be done in a telephone blitz, in coordination with a local publicity campaign. But person-to-person contact is still the most effective.

In many cities, the Jaycees have helped for many years with summer job campaigns. With more and more young people looking for summer jobs every year, kids from the ghettos and other poverty areas need more help than ever before. I hope the Jaycees will redouble their efforts to find summer jobs for disadvantaged youths next year and will coordinate their efforts, as much as possible, with the local NAB.

In both the basic jobs and summer jobs campaigns, the Jaycees can help multiply its efforts—to reach out and contact far more employers than we are now reaching. The additional employers the Jaycees could help us bring into the JOBS program range into the tens of thousands—the jobs opened to the unemployed into the hundreds of thousands. This is—and I hope you will feel about it the same way I do—a great opportunity for young men and women—the business and community leaders of tomorrow—to pitch in and make their weight felt for a vital cause, and in a realistic and effective program.

It may sound awesome but the task for NAB is really a simple one, if all of us will but dedicate ourselves to it. We don't have to concern ourselves with legislation, with housing, or with other social welfare programs. What we are being asked to do is what business knows how to do better than anyone else: Provide jobs for people.

Our part of this is to make sure every businessman in America sees the opportunity and understands its importance. In this way we can help find those jobs for the unemployed. Real jobs, lasting jobs, jobs that will lead a man on to a progressive path of success.

Years ago, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes said: "It is required of a man that he feel the passion and action of his time, at peril of being judged not to have lived."

Gentleman, our future, and the future of our country, lie ahead.

DRAFT REFORM

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, as talk among officials and in the media continues concerning troop withdrawals, and de-Americanization of the American effort in the Vietnam war, with corresponding speculation of lowering draft calls and even reducing the overall size of American Armed Forces, the subject of reforming our draft system becomes more important.

Because of the wide planning and analysis of American armed strength which must be made in these kinds of discussions, it is imperative that the question of the draft system be included. This means that now is the time for congressional debate over reforms of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, not when it expires in 1971.

Therefore, there is a need for widespread discussion of this important issue: within Congress, within the various media, and within the public at large.

One such statement was recently made in an editorial published by a distinguished Pennsylvania newspaper, the Harrisburg Patriot. I was impressed by the editorial, and wrote to the Patriot's executive editor to praise his initiative.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial on draft reform and my own letter to the editor be printed in the RECORD.

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

DRAFT REFORM: IT SHOULD INCLUDE A NEW DIRECTOR

An overhaul of the nation's draft machinery is imminent and speculation about its new form is rampant. The few facts which have emerged are encouraging:

President Nixon, speaking at the governors' conference at Colorado Springs on Monday, indicated that an executive order would be issued shortly.

The Pentagon has delayed since the due date of Aug. 1 the notification to Selective Service of the size of the draft call for October.

Selective Service officials have prepared material on a lottery system for the White House.

The President has said he favors drafting 19-year-olds first, thereby eliminating the years of uncertainty facing today's men of draft age (19–26).

Another point is obvious, though it hasn't been mentioned publicly by anyone in the Administration. A meaningful draft reform would contribute greatly toward a peaceful atmosphere on the nation's college and university campuses, where fall terms are just beginning.

President Nixon is considering reform through executive order because a bill on the subject sent to Congress this spring has collected more dust than support. The bill, representing the Administration's first choice, calls for an artificial lottery of the type which Congress must approve under provisions of the 1967 Selective Service Act.

The lottery system President Nixon is considering now could be put into effect without congressional action. It would be based on date of birth rather than on a modern version of plucking numbers from a fishbowl.

Whether this system or another is unveiled on the President's return to Washington next week is of no more importance than the people selected to run it.

Gen. Lewis B. Hershey has been director of the Selective Service System since 1941. He is 75 and even if he were qualified in every other respect it would be appropriate to suggest his retirement.

Unfortunately, advanced age is the least of the general's serious shortcomings. His autocratic tendencies have become more pronounced in recent years and his latest violation of the law is particularly blatant.

He has usurped the functions of the appeals board to the extent that one of the three members resigned and another was asked by the White House to withdraw amid serious charges that the general was taking over the appeals board by crude force.

Two new members have been appointed by President Nixon but they aren't likely to fare much better than their predecessors until General Hershey is replaced.

SEPTEMBER 9, 1969.

JAMES R. DORAN,
Executive Editor, The Harrisburg Patriot, Harrisburg, Pa.

DEAR JIM: I was delighted to see your Friday, September 5, editorial "Draft Reform", and I share your encouragement over reports that President Nixon is making plans to implement "youngest first", "random selection", and "one-year eligibility" principles in the draft.

The operation of the Selective Service today is grossly inefficient, its policies are inequitable and arbitrary, and reform is essential. Proposals I have introduced include institution of a national manpower pool, with computerized selection methods and mandatory national standards for exemptions and deferments, in addition to the reforms suggested by the President, but I wholeheartedly support these important first steps towards draft reform.

Your reference to the relationship of the draft and college turmoil is most pertinent. One of the factors which causes much student unrest is the continuation of archaic governmental practices and procedures, which persuades young people that their government is no longer relevant to modern problems. Perhaps the most archaic system in government, and the one which most directly relates to these young people, is the draft system. Reform of the draft will go a long way towards showing young and old alike that institutions which no longer function properly can be updated.

Congratulations on making a significant public statement in favor of draft reform, which I hope will help lead to a public demand for immediate Congressional action.

Sincerely,

RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,
U.S. Senator.

EFFECT OF TAX BILL ON TAX-EXEMPT STATUS OF STATE AND LOCAL BONDS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have spoken on sereval previous occasions in opposition to the revocation of the tax-exempt status of State and local bonds.

Mr. Patrick Healy, executive vice president of the National League of Cities, has written a most persuasive article entitled "The Assault on Tax-Exempt Bonds" for publication in Tax Policy, a bimonthly publication of the Tax Institute of America.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Healy's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE ASSAULT ON TAX-EXEMPT BONDS

(By Patrick Healy)

"Property taxes will be increased 6 per cent across the board; charges to water and sewer users will have to be raised 10 per cent."

This statement by the mayor of one large midwestern city indicates what would be the effect on his city of making municipal bond interest subject to federal taxation. Similar effects will be felt throughout the country. Thus, hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of homeowners, water users, and other users of local government services would be taxed under the terms of the hasty, ill-considered, and fundamental changes to the whole federal system contained in the innocent-looking tax bill recently passed by the United States House of Representatives. We hope that the Senate will remove from the bill what could cause a true "taxpayer's revolt" of mammoth proportions.

How did this alarming prospect come about? Not by a frontal assault on the immunity of the state and local government bonds from taxation by the federal government, as has failed miserably in the past. Rather, this time, a more devious device has been used to include income from municipal bonds in calculation of a minimum income tax on individuals (but not as yet on corporations). This takes form in the so-called "limit on tax preferences" and in the "allocation of deductions"—very technical and difficult to explain to members of Congress, not to mention the great mass of homeowners and other voters.

But the result of causing higher municipal bond interest costs to local taxpayers is the same, whether using the frontal assault or the devious device. Indeed, the mere announcement of decisions by the House Ways and Means Committee caused a major upheaval in the municipal bond market as investors in municipal bonds lost their confidence in the durability of tax exemption. Bond yields, already pushed to record high rates by the present inflationary character of the economy, jumped an additional ½ of 1 percentage point in response to Ways and Means Committee decisions, quickly ratified by the whole House.

The tax exemption of state and local government bonds has never been under such sustained, heavy attack from so many quarters. By riding the crest of an unprecedented public demand for general reform of the federal tax structure, itself an unquestionably laudable objective, the opponents of the tax-exempt status of state and local bonds, or "municipal bonds" as they are commonly called, have made considerable headway toward overturning the traditional, in fact historical, tax-free status of these bonds. These opponents have based their attack principally on two arguments:

1. That the federal government loses more tax revenue through tax exemption of municipal bonds than states and localities gain in lower financing costs which result from the tax-exempt feature of the bonds, and,

2. That the tax-exempt feature is some kind of major "loophole" in the federal tax system, the closing of which will produce greater tax equity.

Much of the misunderstanding with regard to the loophole question has come about from lumping tax exemption together with such currently unpopular tax avoidance devices as unlimited charitable contributions, accelerated real estate depreciation, hobby farming, mineral depletion allowances, and the like. Municipal bond interest is distinct from these other tax benefits in that it relates not to economic policy but to a constitutionally delineated system of government operation.

Now comes a new approach in the form of concern for the ability of the state and local governments to find a large enough market for their tax-exempt bonds to meet rising capital needs.

In the May-June, 1969, issue of Tax Policy, Professor Stanley S. Surrey of the Harvard Law School argues that a probable high level of new tax-exempt bond issues over the next decade will raise serious problems for states and localities in reference to their ability to raise capital funds, and raises problems for the equity of our federal tax system. He goes

on to state that this rapidly increasing volume based on the tax-exempt privilege creates a powerful buyer's market that works against states and localities as they realize less and less advantage from the tax-exempt privilege. He also states that as interest rates increase as a result of this phenomenon, bond buyers will get even greater tax savings from their investments. He then calls on those interested in the financing plight of state and local governments to consider whether new financing techniques are available and appropriate to the needs of bond issues.

This subject is of paramount importance to citizens and government officials alike, and I am delighted to be accorded the opportunity to respond to the case put forward by Mr. Surrey. He has been regarded by many as among the foremost opponents of the tax-exempt feature of state and local bond financing. He does not, however, understand the complexities of the market place for securities issued by the state and local governments, nor does he appreciate the intricacies of intergovernmental finance which so clearly underlie discussions of proposed alternative financing methods as well as the basic rationale for tax exemption.

CAPITAL FINANCING NEEDS IN PERSPECTIVE

State and local debt outstanding has increased by 89 per cent since 1960. Unquestionably the greatest need for public improvement expenditure has existed recently and will continue to exist at the state and especially at the local level. While there does loom ahead a substantial increase in state and local capital borrowing the identifiable trend in this area does not warrant alarm.

Mr. Surrey estimates that net additions to tax-exempt financing will, within ten years, total two to three times the present net level of approximately 10 billion per year. He does not mention, however, that the present volume of municipal financing is, if anything, lagging somewhat behind the level projected by the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress in 1966,[1] certainly the most comprehensive and most recent estimate available. Table 1 shows three sets of actual and projected underwriting figures for the period 1960–1975.

TABLE 1

[In millions]

	Growth at 8.7 percent	Growth at 10 percent (Surrey)	Actual	Joint Economic Committee
1960	$7,230	$7,230	$7,230	----------
1961	7,859	7,953	8,360	----------
1962	8,543	8,748	8,558	----------
1963	9,286	9,623	10,107	----------
1964	10,094	10,585	10,544	----------
1965	10,972	11,644	11,084	----------
1966	11,927	12,808	[1] 10,589	$14,200
1967	12,965	14,089	[2] 12,988	14,900
1968	14,093	15,498	[3] 14,044	15,700
1969	15,319	17,048	----------	16,600
1970	16,652	18,753	----------	17,600
1971	18,101	20,628	----------	18,600
1972	19,676	22,691	----------	19,500
1973	21,388	24,960	----------	20,800
1974	23,249	27,450	----------	21,800
1975	25,272	30,202	----------	22,700

[1] Excludes $500,000,000 industrial aid financing.
[2] Excludes $1,300,000,000 industrial aid financing.
[3] Excludes $1,600,000,000 industrial aid financing, and $730,000,000 anticipatory financing to avoid provision of Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968, Watson amendment in California, and similar measure in Oregon.

[1] *State and Local Public Facility Needs and Financing,* Study prepared for the Subcommittee on Economic Progress of the Joint Economic Committee, 89th Congress, 2d Session, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966. The National League of Cities, in conjunction with the Urban Institute, is currently engaged in updating data on anticipated capital outlays of states and municipalities through 1975. Data from this study are not yet available.

As shown in Table 1, Mr. Surrey estimates a growth of new issues of 10 per cent during the most recent period when, in fact, excluding industrial aid financing which for all practical purposes has now been terminated by the Revenue Control and Expenditure Act of 1968, the true growth of the most recent period is approximately 8.7 per cent. That does not at first glance seem to be a major differential; but by 1975, assuming a base of $15.0 billion normal financing this year, underwriting volume would be overstated by 7.4 per cent. By 1980 underwriting volume would be overstated by 14 per cent.

The important point, as economist Sidney Homer has stated, is:

A basic rule of economics is that "human wants are infinite." Nobody thinks of estimating next year's Gross National Product by adding up everything that everybody will want. Similarly it can be said that "Capital requirements are infinite," or that "State and municipal requirements are infinite." The determining factor of the volume of new facilities that will be created is not need; the limiting factor always is somebody's ability and willingness to finance new facilities and somebody else's ability and willingness to service the debt. Facilities are very expensive. Taxes are already high. Construction on credit costs vastly more than pay-as-you-go construction. Therefore, in explaining the moderate volume of state and municipal financing in recent years and in estimating its future volume, a catalogue of needs or wants (while useful) is not as important as an estimate of the future taxability of the community and the cost and availability of credit.[2]

Thus, capital expansion by states and localities is tempered by the law of supply and demand and by sound financial planning and establishment of priorities by public officials. The plain truth of the matter is that, as has been true in the past, the highest priority water pollution problem, school building problems, housing problems, and other public service demands will be taken care of first and the less vital projects will have to wait their turn. As we are learning to our dismay, no nation is rich enough to fulfill all of its aspirations as opposed to all of its necessities. Thus *"enormous increase"* in state and local capital needs, and "exploding replacement needs" in schools, for example, are phrases which avoid giving any weight to the substantial replacement which has already been part of the post-war boom in school construction.

Ironically, the chief tangible item which would support any drastic increase in state and local debt relates to federal assistance programs such as water pollution control, airport construction, and so forth. Pressures on the federal government, to quote Mr. Surrey, have recently "caused attention to be focused on the potentialities of debt service grants to state and local governments . . . rather than the lump-sum grants that have been more traditional." What this means is that the federal government, in order to make a semblance of meeting unfilled financial commitments to states and localities, is really attempting to alleviate its own budget problems and avoid increasing federal debt. This pushes an added capital burden on to state and local governments by forcing them to raise the federal share of program costs in addition to their own share. Such a drastic shift in the federal aid delivery system would indeed give those who wished one an opportunity to conclude that the market would have an insuperable problem.

What we need above all is the careful and painstaking approach manifested in the 1966 Joint Economic Committee study, certainly a landmark in the field. True, some of the assumptions underlying that pioneering study may need to be re-examined and possibly revised in the light of recent inflationary economic experience. A diversity of views exists among economists as to whether a substantial increase in state and local government financing in the period ending in 1975 will be experienced and whether adequate investment funds will be available to meet these needs. Certainly the potential market behavior of the commercial banks during this period is of the utmost importance, since they are the major buyers of state and local government securities. But hard facts and sound economic theories based on those facts are the answer, not unsubstantiated guesswork.

[2] *Ibid.*, Volume 2, pp. 276–77.

PRESENT COSTS OF MUNICIPAL BONDS

In discussing the present market, Mr. Surrey points to the "inevitable" rise in tax-exempt interest vis-à-vis corporate bonds of comparable quality. This process is not proved by any statistical evidence. As he himself admits elsewhere in his discussion, municipal rates have held remarkably steady at approximately 70 per cent of comparable taxable interest rates for a considerable period. Even now, in the fourth year of unexampled high rates of interest and under the pressure of monetary restraint, the present ratio is only 75 per cent. If the inflationary economic situation cools and Congress stops tampering with the tax-exempt status of municipal bonds, this ratio should once again stabilize at about 70 per cent and continue to offer its usual economic advantage to public bond issuers.

Since preparation of this article, the ratio has narrowed to 81 percent, mostly in response to market uncertainty caused by passage of the Tax Reform Act by the House of Representatives.

THE EQUITY QUESTION

In the course of this discussion, Mr. Surrey says: "Tax-exempt interest ranks second after capital gains taxation—perhaps third if we knew more about the magnitude of accelerated depreciation on buildings—among the factors enabling high-income taxpayers to reduce their effective rate of tax." This comment gives an impression that tax-exempt interest is a much more important factor in tax reduction for high-income taxpayers than is actually the case. The table cited by Mr. Surrey as the basis for his statement is in a study prepared in the Treasury Department and covers aggregate figures for taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes of $100,000 or more, 1967 level.

TABLE 2

	(In millions)
Amended adjusted gross income	$16,720
Less—personal deductions (taxes, interest, charitable contributions, etc.) but not including the unlimited charitable contribution	2,350
Amended taxable income	14,370
Less:	
½ of capital gains on assets actually sold	3,775
Exempt interest on State and local bonds	440
Deduction for unlimited charitable contribution	105
Farm "tax losses"	70
Excess percentage depletion	60
Taxable income	9,870
Tax	4,715
Tax as percent of taxable income	47.8
Tax as percent of amended taxable income	32.8
Tax as percent of total income	28.2

Source: Tax Reform Studies and Proposals, U.S. Treasury Department, Joint Publication, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, and Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate, Washington; Government Printing Office, 1969, p. 83.

It shows (a) "amended adjusted gross income," defined as adjusted gross income after deductions for "proper business expenses," and increased by "the exempt part of capital gain, exempt interest, and excess percentage depletion," then (b) "amended taxable income" after taking out personal deductions

(taxes, interest paid, charitable contribution, etc.), and (c) taxable income. The small element of truth in his statement depends upon highly selective statistical definition of the phrase "effective rates of tax," the particular definition being the ratio of tax paid to "amended taxable income." The deductions are eliminated from the comparison although they, too, are "factors enabling high-income taxpayers to reduce their effective rate of tax." Deductions totaled $2,350 million, and even if one-quarter were attributed each to *contributions* and *interest paid*, this would be $580 million each, compared with the $440 million interest on state and local bonds! Looked at in this way, interest on state and local bonds is probably no higher than the fourth or fifth largest factor instead of second or third.

The tabulated figures, if accurate, do disclose the relative importance of state and local interest as a factor of tax reduction to the individuals with incomes of over $100,000 a year, and its importance may be honestly computed by its relation to the total aggregate reduction in tax base—all factors—of $6,850 million ($16,720 million "amended adjusted gross income" less $9,870 million taxable income). State and local bond interest of $440 million is only 6.6 per cent of the total for all factors, and less than 12 per cent of the most important item, i.e., capital gains. To bill this as the "second" or "perhaps third" largest factor is at best to exaggerate beyond the bounds of ardent advocacy, and at worst to falsify the record.

EQUITY ISN'T EVERYTHING

Going to the guts of the matter, we are dealing with an issue far more complex and important than the role tax-exempt bond interest plays in tax avoidance. Attempting to tax income from municipal bonds automatically raises the complexities of:

1. Structural problems of the federal system itself and the allocation of powers and duties among three levels of governments—federal, state and local;

2. Complicated economic market relationships which involve the proper functioning of both the public and private sectors of the entire capital market;

3. Important legal problems which certainly would lead to protracted litigation ending in the Supreme Court; and

4. The problems of making the total tax structure—federal, and particularly state and local—function as fairly and effectively as possible by not further depressing financial resources of states and localities.

It is on the latter point, especially, that the so-called quest for equity falls on its face. As Nashville Mayor and National League of Cities President C. Beverly Briley stated recently, "It is the height of irony that an effort to tax a very few individuals receiving income from municipal bonds will boomerang against hundreds of thousands of local property taxpayers and users of municipal services who will have to bear the burden of increased debt service costs." As investors lose confidence in the integrity of tax exemption and the good faith of the federal government, their waning confidence will be reflected in higher interest rates bid for new bond issues. Higher interest costs added to an already heavily strained property tax system, a system known to be regressive, will neither contribute to taxpayer equity nor help financially hard-pressed cities meet mounting capital and operating revenue needs. Even if interest rates rise only 1 percentage point, it would cost on the order of an additional $150 million annually for a single year's volume of $15 billion. Over a 14 year period, the average life of long-term general obligation bond issues, this comes to about $2 billion.

I shall not dwell on the constitutional issues involved in the taxation of interest from municipal bonds. This is an issue which, I am confident, will be forced into the courts if the legislation proposed by the House Ways and Means Committee is enacted. Regardless of the outcome, lengthy litigation will cast a further stigma on municipal bonds which could even halt investment until the issue is resolved.

Mr. Surrey, however, has referred in his article to a statement made in 1942 by the Department of Justice before the House Ways and Means Committee to the effect that a tax on state and local bond interest "would be constitutional" and then makes the categorical claim that "certainly nothing has happened in the intervening years to cause lawyers to believe that such a prediction would, to say the least, be any less valid today." Presumably, Mr. Surrey meant to say that the Department of Justice in 1942 took the view that the Supreme Court would uphold an attempt to subject the income from municipal bonds to taxation and that no decisions have been rendered in the intervening years to change this prediction. Obviously, since there has been no direct attack on the tax status of municipal bond interest which has been the subject of litigation, "nothing has happened," to use the author's own words, to change this. In short, Mr. Surrey is stating only that the Department's opinion of 1942 has not been tested in court. The statement is really meaningless, but it has the effect of giving the reader the impression that it is all over but the shouting. Mr. Surrey only cites a "contrary argument" of the Attorney General of Maryland in a footnote, and makes no further reference to comments by attorneys deeply involved in the municipal bond business holding similar views. Without better information, the reader must feel that the only valid viewpoint is that set forth in the main body of the article and that "contrary" arguments are not to be considered seriously.

The facts, of course, are different. There is a substantial body of respectable legal opinion holding that an attack on the concept of intergovernmental immunity would be defeated in the Supreme Court. In fact, the present Administration, in proposing its "limit on tax preferences" program, recommended that the interest from municipal bonds not be included because of the market impact and doubtful constitutionality of such a move.[4] An attempt to conceal or downgrade the existence of such a viewpoint is misleading, particularly when the issue has already been clouded with misinformation and emotional appeals to "tax equity."

The reciprocal immunity doctrine is derived from the constitutional foundations of our federal system of government. The federal system is a remarkably durable system because each level of government has exercised a degree of independence of action within the framework established by the United States Constitution and the constitutions of the various states. This does not mean the actions of one level are isolated from or unaffected by those of another. Nevertheless, integrity of local policymaking must be respected and maintained in order that state and local governments can fulfill their primary responsibilities to the needs and demands of local citizens. If the federal government interferes with local fiscal decisions through federal taxation or supervision of local debt management, it interferes with the independence of judgment that local agencies must exercise in determining their own policies and programs which are dependent upon capital financing. Officials of local government will zealously preserve and protect the independence of local policymaking.[5]

PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES FOR CAPITAL FINANCING

This brings us to the central objective of Mr. Surrey's article and of this article, the proposal that an alternative for financing state and local capital projects is needed. Do we need such an alternative, is such an alternative desirable aside from the question of need, and, do we know enough about such alternatives to adopt one at the present time?

To simplify, while differing in mechanics, most of these proposals revolve basically around an offer of a federal government subsidy on municipal bond interest rates in return for a waiver of tax exemption by state and local bond issuers.

Alternatives for capital financing should be viewed constructively. States and localities have utilized a relatively stable source of capital funds in the past and will continue to depend upon the tax-exempt bond market in the future for an adequate supply of capital funds. While evidence suggests that this source will continue to meet the foreseeable needs of states and localities, it is the only source of capital financing available aside from the luxurious pay-as-you-go method.

In my opinion, any proposed alternative system of capital financing would have to meet the following criteria:

1. First, it must preserve the present federal system and protect the state and local governments from federal domination.

2. The state and local governments must preserve their freedom to act, independent of federal control, on matters of purely state and local concern.

3. Any federal subsidy must be at least as generous as the present financing advantage which the states and municipalities enjoy by virtue of tax exemption.

4. The federal government's obligation to provide a subsidy in lieu of tax exemption must be automatic and irrevocable.

5. The states and municipalities must have unrestricted access, at their own option, to both tax-exempt and taxable markets.

6. Financing procedures must not be subject to delay by federal red tape which might make state and local governments miss their best markets or involve them in increased capital costs as construction costs keep rising.

REAL COSTS OF TAX EXEMPTION

Mr. Surrey states in his article: "Those interested in the federal tax structure deplore the method of achieving this effect because of both the tax favoritism and the inefficiency or wastage involved in resorting to the technique of favoritism, in that more federal tax revenue is lost than the local governments obtain in aid." Again he states: "That exemption is a way of supplying federal aid—presently amounting to about $1.2 billion annually (at a revenue cost of $1.8 billion—to those governments through the lower interest rates."

The facts are quite otherwise. According to the United States Department of Commerce, gross state and local debt outstanding in the three most recent years and interest paid on that debt are estimated as follows:

---

[4] See the statement of the Honorable Charls E. Walker, Under Secretary of the Treasury, before the Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, April 22, 1969.

[5] For an excellent brief on the constitutional issue, see the Statement of Northcutt Ely, General Counsel, American Public Power Association, in Hearings on the subject of tax reform before the Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, 91st Congress, 1st Session, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1969, Part 6, pp. 2195–202.

TABLE 3

	1966	1967	1968
Beginning	$104,700,000,000	$111,600,000,000	$122,000,000,000
End	111,600,000,000	122,000,000,000	132,300,000,000
Total	216,300,000,000	233,600,000,000	254,300,000,000
Outstanding debt	108,150,000,000	116,800,000,000	127,150,000,000
Interest paid	3,451,000,000	3,813,000,000	4,437,000,000
Interest cost (percent)	3.19	3.26	3.49

Let us make the simplistic assumption that the United States Treasury makes, which we believe to be partially in error, but which probably represents their best case. Briefly stated, it is that present holders of tax exempts have a weighted average marginal tax rate of 42 per cent and that the federal government, therefore, loses the amount of increased tax revenue it would derive from those holders, if they should be forced, or had been forced, to purchase taxable securities instead.

It is ridiculous to assume, as Mr. Surrey apparently does, that the states and municipalities would ever have surrendered the 30 per cent financing advantage derived from tax exemption in the past or would ever surrender it in the future unless they received in exchange an irrevocable subsidy at least equal to the advantage surrendered. This is recognized by the proposal of Senator William Proxmire (D-Wisc.) and Congressman Wright Patman (D-Tex.) for a Municipal Capital Market Expansion Corporation, and the Urban Development Bank proposal offered by former President Johnson, both of which offered a subsidy of 33⅓ per cent. From the point of view of the state and local governments, it would be foolish to yield a financing advantage of 30 per cent *without federal control* for a subsidy of 33⅓ per cent *with federal control* merely because they are told there may be some hypothetical advantage by way of increased tax revenues to the federal government.

Indeed there is little economic inducement under normal conditions for public issuers to shift markets and they are unlikely to do so unless they receive a better *quid pro quo* than a subsidy of 33⅓ per cent. This is recognized by the emergence from the National Governors Conference of the so-called double-coupon proposal which envisages an irrevocable open-end 50 per cent subsidy to be paid by the federal Treasury. Actually, a good case can be made for a 50 per cent subsidy on grounds of equity. As pointed out by Sidney Homer in the 1966 JEC study:

The fact that the gross interest rate usually paid on tax exempts is well below other interest rates is often misinterpreted as an inducement to borrow large sums. However, when municipalities or states borrow they often have to find additional revenues to meet debt service—immediately, not 30 years hence. And they cannot deduct their interest payments as corporations can so that Uncle Sam pays half. They pay it all.[6]

In all fairness, it must be pointed out that from an economic point of view the state and local governments would benefit substantially from an automatic irrevocable 50 per cent federal subsidy. It could scarcely be otherwise since they would be trading a 30 per cent financing advantage for a 50 per cent federal subsidy.

Mr. Surrey's analysis leaves the impression that the Treasury would gain a substantial amount of revenue if the present tax exemption for municipal securities were terminated and the federal government subsidized states and localities for the higher interest payments that they would have to make. It is not at all clear, however, that when the dust settles, this would in fact be the result. For termination of the exemption would result in vast upheaval in present financial markets. Many investors now drawn to municipal securities would no longer be attracted to them. These would tend to be taxpayers with high marginal tax rates. Individuals, in particular, would desert the municipal market in favor of equities. That is, individuals who now find municipal securities attractive because of the tax exemption would seek out investments with the next best tax advantage. They would probably turn, therefore, to investments which offered capital gains.

Other investors would be drawn into the municipal market by the increased yields which would be available if the tax-exempt status were terminated. These investors would be the ones who are themselves exempt from federal taxation, such as pension funds, foundations, and university endowment funds. Because they are tax exempt, these institutions would purchase fixed income securities which had a high yield relative to other securities offered in the market.

As a result of these shifts, taxable municipal issues would not be taxed at an average rate as high as 42 per cent. The rate would be much lower, probably no higher than 25 per cent. It would be unrealistic to assume, in other words, that the composition of a taxable municipal market would be the same as that of the tax-exempt municipal market.

If the average tax rate applied to interest on state and local government securities were less than the rate of the subsidy—which we think is the only reasonable assumption—then the cost of the subsidy to the Treasury would exceed the increased revenues due to the termination of tax exemption.

Let us for a moment assume that the marginal tax rate is 42 per cent. Table 4 shows calculations which demonstrate that if the most realistic subsidy rate of 50 per cent were utilized, the federal government would carry a net revenue loss on its subsidy program. Table 4 also shows that the federal government would realize a very serious loss if, as our studies show, the marginal tax rate of investors was 25 per cent. Only in the one instance of a 33⅓ per cent subsidy based on the incorrect assumption of a 42 per cent marginal tax rate would there be any federal revenue gain. But such a small subsidy would not be attractive enough, in light of potential dangers of the plan, to attract bond issuers.

TABLE 4

Savings to State and local governments because of tax exemption:	
$127,150,000,000 at 5 percent (taxable)	$6,357,500,000
$127,150,000,000 at 3½ percent (tax-exempt)	4,450,250,000
Savings to state and local governments	1,907,250,000
Range of subsidies:	
33⅓ percent of $6,357,500,000	2,119,167,000
50 percent of $6,357,500,000	3,178,750,000
Federal revenue gains (no tax exemption—increased tax revenues):	
Increased revenue at 42 percent of $6,357,500,000	2,670,150,000
Increased revenue at 25 percent of $6,357,500,000	1,589,375,000
Case 1:	
Increased revenue at 42 percent	2,670,150,000
Subsidy at 33⅓ percent	2,119,157,000
Federal gain	550,983,000

TABLE 4—Continued

Case 2:	
Increased revenue at 42 percent	2,670,150,000
Subsidy at 50 percent	3,178,750,000
Federal loss	508,600,000

Estimated properly, the so-called revenue loss to the federal government dwindles to a loss of $551 million, the amount of the federal government's net gain after taking into account the federal subsidies in lieu of tax exemption it would have been compelled to pay. That is the most favorable case for the federal government.

Assume that it has to pay instead a subsidy of 50 per cent. It is now benefiting from past tax-exempt financing to the tune of $509 million, or the net loss it would otherwise sustain after accounting for federal subsidy in lieu of taxation.

The basic principle is that even using the United States Treasury's assumptions, the federal government is bound to lose if the subsidy rate on the taxable obligations is above the marginal average tax rate of those who presumably would be forced into the taxable market.

Let us see how this works out with current financing as calculated in Table 5.

TABLE 5

Present annual savings to State and local governments because of tax exemption:	
$15,000,000,000 at 8 percent (taxable)	$1,200,000,000
$15,000,000,000 at 5.6 percent (tax exempt)	840,000,000
State and local government savings	360,000,000
Range of subsidies:	
33⅓ percent of $1,200,000,000	400,000,000
50 percent of $1,200,000,000	600,000,000
Range of Federal revenue gains or losses assuming no tax exemption:	
Increased revenues at 42 percent of $1,200,000,000	504,000,000
Increased revenues at 25 percent of $1,200,000,000	300,000,000
Case 1:	
Increased revenue at 42 percent	504,000,000
Subsidy at 33⅓ percent	400,000,000
Annual Federal gain	104,000,000
Case 2:	
Increased revenue at 42 percent	504,000,000
Subsidy at 50 percent	600,000,000
Annual Federal loss	96,000,000
Case 3:	
Increased revenue at 25 percent	300,000,000
Subsidy at 33⅓ percent	400,000,000
Annual Federal loss	100,000,000
Case 4:	
Increased revenue at 25 percent	300,000,000
Subsidy at 50 percent	600,000,000
Annual Federal loss	300,000,000

Thus, the maximum benefit to the federal government on the most favorable assumption shows an annual gain of $104 million. If it pays a 50 per cent subsidy, it will lose $96 million.

The following table shows the cumulative effect:

[In millions of dollars]

	Annual financing	Cumulative annual financing	Cumulative annual gains case 1	Cumulative annual losses case 2
1970	16,652	16,652	115,400	106,600
1971	18,101	34,753	240,900	229,400
1972	19,676	54,429	377,300	348,300
1973	21,388	75,817	525,600	485,200
1974	23,249	99,066	686,800	634,000
1975	25,272	124,338	862,800	795,700

The point is that the federal government's subsidy plan may not be all that it is cracked up to be.

Furthermore, Treasury costs would be increased in another way. Termination of tax

[6] *State and Local Facility Needs and Financing, op. cit.*, Volume 2, p. 275.

exemption for municipal securities would narrow the market for long-term issues in general. Thus interest rates on Treasury bonds would be higher than they otherwise would be. The general increase in Treasury borrowing costs might be as high as 50 basis points. Applied to the very large total of federal debt held, such an interest cost increase would clearly be very significant. This higher interest cost might be incurred only gradually as new issues of taxable municipals replace outstanding tax-exempt issues, but it would be important nonetheless.

A general increase in long-term borrowing costs would also affect corporate borrowing and individuals securing a home mortgage. A strict accounting would take these added costs into consideration.

Mr. Surrey's implication that termination of tax-exempt status for municipal securities would involve a net saving to the Treasury is, therefore, clearly unrealistic if we consider the shape of the world after an adjustment had been made by the new law. Furthermore, in the interim period in which this adjustment was being made, there would be heavy added costs as underwriters struggled to discover the new configuration of the financial markets.

A MORE CONSIDERED APPROACH NEEDED

We would have hoped that the idea proposed by Mr. Surrey and the legislation prepared by the Ways and Means Committee could have awaited the results of a study currently under way by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. This study is expected to be completed by December. It involves a detailed examination of all the proposed alternatives and their effect on traditional capital financing, their relationship to tax reform, and their possible benefits to states and localities. This Commission, composed of representatives from all three levels of government—federal, state, and municipal—as well as distinguished representatives from the private sector, could render an important public service by impartially investigating the problems in this area and providing a rational and enlightened basis for their solution.

It seems incredibly ill-considered and hasty to make fundamental changes, as the Ways and Means Committee has proposed, in a system that has endured since the beginning of the Republic and served states and local governments well through many difficult times, merely on the basis of one day's hearings, very nearly the total extent of the House Ways and Means Committee's public consideration of this vital problem. The Investment Bankers Association, in its testimony before the Ways and Means Committee on March 11, 1969, raised important economic and market questions to which, as it candidly admitted, there were as yet no satisfactory answers. Nevertheless, no further investigation by the committee of these questions has, to our knowledge, taken place, and virtually all consideration of proposed legislation has proceeded behind closed doors. Such a method of procedure does little to inspire confidence that legislation emerging from this committee is based on a deliberate and impartial weighing of all the factors involved. On the contrary, it seems to bespeak a panic haste to shoot first and ask questions later. We hope the Senate will move more carefully when it begins consideration of these matters.

If the issuance of taxable municipal bonds in significant amounts does eventually prove necessary and desirable, we believe it extremely unwise in the interim to throw sand in the gears of the present tax-exempt market through the introduction of either the "limit on tax preferences" or the "allocation of deductions" proposals until such time as the proper legislative bases have been established in the various states and the initial problems of marketing such taxable securities have been worked out. It is foolish to burn down the old house before the new one is ready to live in.

Furthermore, if such proposals are intended to render the functioning of the present tax-exempt market difficult or impossible in order to force a recourse to the taxable markets, this immediately raises grave doubts about the "voluntary" nature of the new taxable financing device and the credibility of those who say they have no wish to destroy the institution of tax exemption as such.

CONCLUSION

The financing needs which state and local governments will face in the years ahead are admittedly great. Let us have careful investigation of these needs, updated regularly if necessary, and the priorities they will command in the hierarchy of all our needs as a nation, and balance against them the not unbounded national economic strength that can be mobilized. We will then be operating rationally as to the need for a major new capital financing mechanism.

Certainly it is not all that clear that the subsidy plans proposed thus far are well enough understood to work as favorably as their proponents suggest. Most fail to account for the large and growing subsidies which the federal government must provide to make a system of taxable state and municipal bonds workable. Second, no weight is given to the "across-the-board" rise in interest rates in the taxable market which will result from the large-scale introduction of taxable municipal bonds into the taxable sector. This development, from the federal government's point of view, will be unfavorable since the increased tax revenues will not compensate for the added interest costs and the necessary federal subsidies in lieu of tax exemption. And last, much more must be known about the impact of such proposals on traditional intergovernmental fiscal relationships.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY WEEK WILL UNDERSCORE VALUE OF OUR TRANSPORTATION LIFELINE TO THE COUNTRY

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, next week our citizens will acclaim the transportation lifeline of the country in observing National Highway Week.

Americans this year will travel more than one trillion—1,000,000,000,000—miles over our network of freeways, tollways, tunnels, bridges, and the numerous other types of surface roads.

Highways are substantial parts of the base of our economic and social development in these United States. New and improved roads mean new plants, new jobs, new housing developments, new schools, new recreation areas, and better access to recreational facilities in general.

The Interstate and Defense Highway program has been in progress for 25 years, during the last 13 of which the Federal Government has provided the major financing for an accelerated construction program better linking the 48 continental States. Approximately 28,219 miles of Interstate and Defense highways were open to traffic this summer, and the authorized total of 42,500 miles should, when completed, permit coast-to-coast driving without stoplights or congestion.

Notwithstanding, we are lagging behind schedule in construction efforts as a result of fund cutbacks, design problems, and pyramiding costs.

The United States now enjoys the greatest highway network of any country in the world, but there is an urgent need to improve many of the roads and the bridge-tunnel-highway systems now in operation.

The growth of our population and our dependency on highways as a means for expediting the efficient flow of goods and services to all parts of the country will continue to require more and more arterial connections.

More than half of the 210 million persons counted in the census of the United States are licensed auto and truck drivers who use our roads and highways. There is now a motor vehicle for every 2.1 persons—26 vehicles for every mile of improved roads.

Virtually everything in an American home today got there—at least part way—via the highway network.

The heartening activities in recent weeks and months intended to bridge the traditional gap between highway builders and conservationists underscore the advances being made to provide better facilities for Americans while protecting the quality of the environment and giving the human side of the problem greater consideration. These efforts to overcome adverse impacts of highway construction on private property and on the environment should improve highway progress and should enhance the usefulness of the road system.

As chairman of the Committee on Public Works and of its Subcommittee on Roads, I commend our Nation's highway system and those who have developed it. The week of September 21–27 will be a significant one—the 1969 edition of the annual National Highway Week. It will be observed with special ceremony and appropriate events in many places and in each instance their sponsors and participants will have our best wishes.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

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

What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no pending business.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS TO NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, 1970

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 11271, the unfinished business.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11271) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ques-

tion is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CANNON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I fully endorse the statement of our chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, the senior Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON). We can take great pride in the achievements of the Apollo manned space flight program. NASA has established a unique record of success in tremendously complex space missions—a record culminating with the great and historic achievement of safely landing on and returning men from the moon, an objective established in 1961. The really significant point to all of this is the demonstrated capability of the United States to perform a variety of complex manned space flight missions which have established this Nation as the world leader in manned space flight. Having established a leadership role we are now at the decision point of whether or not to maintain this role and the capability to support future national space objectives such as those contained in the report of President Nixon's Space Task Group, released this week.

This bill (H.R. 11271) provides $3,715,527,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1970. This is only the bare minimum to maintain a balanced and forward-looking space program. The bill provides for an ongoing program for lunar exploration at a rate of three Saturn V launches a year. It continues the work on the earth-orbital Apollo application project, and it continues production and availability of our proven large launch vehicle, the Saturn V, for future applications of the type recommended by President Nixon's Space Task Group. The lunar exploration and the Apollo applications projects will utilize existing Apollo hardware and will permit us to continue to develop our capability in manned space flight. Activities of NASA will, under the fiscal year 1970 budget, preserve this capability for the next few years while we reach a national decision as to future U.S. space exploration.

One thing is clear. If we are going to continue to lead the world in science and technology, we must continue to support fully a broad-based program in advanced research and technology. Many programs and projects in this area do not catch public attention the way manned space missions do. But, it is the pursuit of just such research tasks and the establishment of new technologies that will enable our Nation to undertake future aeronautical and space activities, to maintain world leadership. These are tasks which involve advancing the state of the art and which by their very nature are long lead-time projects. They are not always susceptible to precise scheduling of results.

One of the principal development programs identified by President Nixon's Space Task Group, which has exhibited great technical success, and one which will guarantee the leadership of the Nation in space over the years ahead, is the nuclear rocket engine program.

Since 1955, this program has proceeded on a sound one-step-at-a time basis—an approach which has been rewarded with demonstrated success in reactor testing and in experimental engine testing. These successes are positive evidence that we have firmly established a base for initiating development of the 75,000-pound thrust NERVA flight engine. This engine gives us twice the performance of any space propulsion system now under development. Testimony before our committee makes it quite clear, in fact, that the initiation of the flight engine development should have been pursued aggressively in fiscal year 1969, for proper phasing of the program. Program authorization and appropriations were provided but adequate funding was not made available. As a consequence, 40 percent of our unique and highly trained personnel were lost to the program.

The bill before the Senate today provides for starting flight engine development, and it provides a modest amount of authorization above that requested by the administration in order to regain some of the momentum which we lost.

History is replete with examples of the many advantages stemming from the availability of advanced, reliable propulsion systems. This has been true particularly in promoting trade and commerce, whether for land or sea transportation or aircraft propulsion. I am convinced that the same principle holds with respect to space propulsion.

I believe it is of great importance to fly a nuclear engine just as soon as practicable. This is a new and different kind of propulsion system. With its increased performance and reliability, it offers tremendous advantages of supply and mobility in space that we cannot ignore. The NERVA rocket engine will provide a high performance, reusable general purpose stage. Regardless of where we place our emphasis between manned or unmanned space operations, the nuclear rocket gives the United States a mobility and flexibility of mission choice that cannot be matched by any now envisaged chemical system.

The key to the success in any nuclear propulsion system is, of course, the reactor. Since the beginning of the Rover program, nuclear rocket reactor technology has had continued success and improvement, as noted in the report of our committee:

> An almost unbroken string of brilliant successes in the testing program has solved all of the major technical problems and brought the project to the point where development of a flight-ready engine and upper stage should begin.

Never before in our Nation's history have we been confronted with such rapid technological change and diversity, with the associated demand that we intelligently choose those areas for development that will assure our future growth and security. From our Nation's experience immediately following the U.S.S.R.'s Sputnik launch in 1957, we recall that propulsion is the key to economic and energetic space operations. For a period of time, due to propulsion failures, we could not get a rocket off the pad. Not that guidance, communications, sensors, weapons, power supplies, and life support systems are not important—but without continually improving propulsion systems, all other aspects of our space program cannot have optimum economic exploitation.

It is my conviction that this advanced propulsion system is the key to our national resolve to keep the space between earth and the moon free from threat.

If we maintain leadership in space technology the need to react will not arise.

Moreover, if we have the energy source available, we can undertake whatever goals the Nation may establish; therefore, I urge the support of the Senate for this program so that in the years ahead we will have the option of doing those things which we may find it important to do. Conversely, if we do not develop this propulsion source—a development estimated to take about 8 years—we will not have the energy source to do things we may very much want to do at that time.

In pursuing this program the Nation also reaps an associated benefit—a benefit which has been characteristic of the entire space program—that of a focal point for advancing the state of science and technology in a great many disciplines in order to achieve the immediate objective.

It is the challenge of solving a problem that motivates men to be resourceful and to invent, thereby uncovering new knowledge which may well have application to other national needs.

In closing, it is my judgment that the program presented in H.R. 11271 has been carefully structured to balance the needs in manned space flight, in space science and applications, and in advanced research and technology within the limitations of a very tight budget, one which recognizes the overall need for fiscal austerity as well as the need to establish a base for maintaining the leadership role in science and technology and the capabilities so visibly demonstrated in the space program.

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

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I commend the members of the committee for the extraordinarily fine cooperation they have demonstrated in their work on the pending bill.

I particularly commend the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) who is a long-time friend and a forceful and capable Senator. He has done a fine job all the way through.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for his very kind remarks.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, at the outset of my remarks I wish to pay

my respects and express my admiration and devotion to the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON). He is one of the hardest working, and most perceptive members of the Senate Committee on Aeronautics and Space Sciences. The Senator from Nevada is not only a very important member of our committee, but he is also an indispensible member of that committee. He is always faithful in his attendance at committee sessions and in fulfilling any requests made by our chairman, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON).

WHY SUPPORT THE SPACE PROGRAM?

Mr. President, the NASA program before the Senate today represents one of the major forces that molds the course of our society.

The national space commitment to land men on the moon and safely return them to earth, a goal now accomplished, was the largest concerted effort ever undertaken by any nation to advance the frontiers of human knowledge. It combined our industrial, governmental, and academic resources to give us an advanced technology second to none.

The energizing force of our space commitment has spread throughout our economy, our educational structure, and our relations with other nations. It advanced the pace of invention, spurred our productivity, helped to insure our national security, stimulated education, and served the cause of peace throughout the world.

Because of the space program, our chances of improving medical care, and finding cures for cancer and heart disease are greater—not less. The same might be said of the chances of improving our educational system and solving a vast range of social problems. This is so because the advanced management and system techniques which evolved in the space program have been perfected to the point where they can be utilized to attack other major problem areas.

A society cannot remain great and strong when it ignores major challenges with which it is faced, particularly when so much of the growth of our economy is associated with technological advance.

Although we are only on the threshold of the space age, new knowledge which we have obtained from space endeavors has revolutionized communications, energy conversion, power generation, transportation, geodesy, navigation, and weather prediction. These are but a few of the many areas of application which already have proved rewarding beyond the dreams of the first space pioneers. But as men learn more, the future benefits from the program will exceed past rewards many times. That is why, in my opinion, the bill before us deserves the support of the Senate. It represents not only the fulfillment of the promises and obligations of the past but a commitment to the future.

Mr. President, as the Presiding Officer knows, we are living in a fast-moving space age, an age of change and challenge. And we must all meet that challenge. We are very fortunate to live in these times to participate in meeting that great challenge.

It is fitting that the Senate vote on the space program at a time when we have achieved the tremendous goal of putting men on the moon. That event, as stated by Astronaut Armstrong, holds significance not only for the United States but for all mankind. By opening up the universe to exploration, we have drawn our world closer together. As we have seen in the unforgettable photographs taken from the Apollo voyages, our planet is a beautiful blue gem set in the lovely majesty of the universal sky, a place where all humans venture the same hazards and share the same hopes.

Mr. President, the space bill now pending before the Senate insures that the United States will continue to devote its efforts to push forward the frontiers of human knowledge. With each stage of discovery, not only is our understanding of the world enlarged but so too is our awareness of the human potential.

Scientists who have avoided new challenges no longer move forward, but begin to stagnate. And societies which have avoided new challenges, no longer moved forward, but began to stagnate and die.

Americans are aware of these new challenges of change offered to all of us. We are determined that our destiny is to move forward.

The exploration of outer space does not mean that we will neglect the pressing problems of our immediate environment. Not at all. It has been proposed that by 1983—which is about the earliest date it can be achieved—we land a man on Mars.

Mr. President, we in Congress are proceeding now—and we are determined to proceed without delay—to take men out of slums and move them into homes in this country before we land a man on Mars. We are determined to do that, and we will do that.

But exploration of outer space provides a new context within which we can look for viable solutions. As we have learned to commit the resources, money, men, and organization necessary to carry on a successful space program, we Americans have acquired the tools which will be necessary to direct the large-scale efforts that will be required to correct social imbalances among our fellow citizens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND addressed the Chair.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, does the Senator from Florida wish to speak?

Mr. HOLLAND. I was going to suggest third reading, if no one else wishes to speak.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, almost 12 years ago on October 4, 1957, the Russians surprised the world with the launching of Sputnik I. Rarely in history has a technological achievement had such an impact on human affairs. Many of us were worried about the military implications because they had used military hardware to launch that satellite.

Former President Johnson was the majority leader of this body at that time. He was also chairman of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, a position which I now have the honor to hold. Many weeks of hearings were held by that subcommittee in the latter part of 1957 and early 1958, the purpose of which was to ascertain the facts about our missile and space developments. The subcommittee unanimously determined that we were dangerously behind in this area and made numerous recommendations as to what we had to do, as a nation, to catch up.

Mr. President, I remember with the most pleasant recollections the array of talent we were able to call in in just a matter of a few days in the way of scientists, military experts, and those who had to do with expertise in the field of rocketry and everything that went along with this problem. I never had a more pleasant experience nor a more satisfying experience. It was an experience I continue to remember. If for no other reason, it showed the vast human resources of our Nation and the tremendous capability we have to meet a given situation, even though this was one situation where we were not fully prepared at that time.

In the past 11 years, many of those recommendations have been carried out. Our accomplishments in space have been little short of miraculous. Our plans have been ambitious and our resolve has been steadfast. We chose as our goal nothing less than landing men on the moon itself. And we succeeded. But let us consider why we did this. The real purpose of that goal was, of course, not just to pull some cosmic stunt, but to have the capability to operate in this new environment—this "new ocean" as the late President Kennedy called it—the capability to operate in a way that would put us second to no nation on this earth.

I remember so well the first extensive hearings that were held on this very Apollo mission in which there was outlined in detail for the first time to Congress the groundwork and the development of this great mission. It was hard to accept it fully and I did not accept it fully. I accepted it on faith.

I like to quote from the late Styles Bridges, who was a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, and who was on the committee. I remember his wise comment at one of our final meetings. He said:

> This is a program that you cannot accept in half or in part; it is all or nothing. You can't go half way to the moon and come back. If we are going to go into this to master space we have to go all the way.

I wish he could share the triumph of this occasion.

But today, nearly 12 years after sputnik, at the same time that we have actually built this great capability, we find ourselves curiously at another cross-

roads. Not as to what we are going to do next year or even the year after that, because the programs that will come to fruit in 1970 and 1971 are already too far down the road to change very much. We are at the crossroads of decision as to what our space program is going to be beyond 1971 and there are three programs in this bill that I would specifically like to discuss in this regard.

The first is the Apollo applications program. This is, in my opinion, the most important of NASA's follow-on programs, since it is the only plan for manned space flight beyond Apollo. It will, in fact, build specifically on the technology and hardware developed during the Apollo program. For very little in the way of additional expenditures, it will allow us to utilize and take advantage of the capability it has cost so much to attain. If we do not continue with this program, then the great expenditures and effort will have been wasted, our technological advantage scrapped, and our vast facilities mothballed. And with the cancellation of the MOL program by the Defense Department, the AAP is the Nation's only program which will help us to determine the capabilities of men during prolonged space flight. In my opinion, it is imperative that we obtain this information.

The second is the resumption of production of the Saturn V vehicle. This is by far the most advanced space launch vehicle known to the world. It has a thrust of 7.5 million pounds and will boost more than a quarter of a million pounds into earth orbit. This is nearly 10 times as much payload as any other vehicle that we have. We have testimony that the Soviets are developing a larger booster and, although there is no evidence that it has flown yet, I have no doubt that they have the capability to do this and are doing it.

And yet, in face of these facts, I doubt if many of my colleagues realize that, due to budgetary pressures, Saturn V production was discontinued in August 1968. Since it takes more than 3 years to build one of these vehicles, the impact of this action would not have been obvious until 1971 or 1972, but scientists and technicians have steadily been laid off since last summer.

The capability to build and launch these vehicles, which has taken us more than 8 years and billions of dollars to attain, has slowly been ebbing away and would soon have been irretrievably lost.

I am happy to say, however, that the current bill contains $46 million for the resumption of Saturn V production at the rate of three per year. While no specific mission has yet been determined for these vehicles we will surely need them, because we would have no manned space program at all after 1972 without them.

The third program in the nuclear rocket engine program known as NERVA I. I know of no scientist or propulsion engineer who does not contend that nuclear energy will eventually be utilized for space propulsion. It is simply a much more efficient way to do it and, if used in an upper stage, this allows you to greatly increase your payloads while still using the same Saturn V first stage booster. The Nation already has $1.1 billion invested in this program and much of this investment would be lost if we do not go forward with the development at this time. In addition, the necessity to start this program up again at some future time would be extremely expensive and could not be done overnight. I might say that the committee feels so strongly about this program that it is the only item in the entire budget that is reported to the Senate at a level higher than the administration's budget request. I fully support the committee action in recommending this increase.

Eleven years ago we did not have the knowledge or the equipment to meet the Russian challenge. We had to build it, the hard way. Today, we are at least on a par with them—obviously ahead in some areas, still behind in others. Today, in constrast to them, we have the capability to meet the challenge. What we need is the will. And to show that will, we must make the decisions now, not 3 or 4 or 10 years from now. I do not want the chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee, whether that is still my honor or someone else's, to have to call for hearings again in a few years in order to try to find out what we have to do to catch up.

Mr. President, I have a very personal feeling about that last remark because there were those of us who went through that decisionmaking process when, frankly, we did not know what to do, but we got some strong and solid advice, and we did come through.

I want to express my appreciation for the privilege of serving on the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee. I appreciate the fine attitude and the work of its present chairman, the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), and, again, the fine attitude and work of the ranking minority member, the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH). I see her at her desk in the Chamber now, where she has been for the past 8 weeks, in her place of duty every day. It shows what a valuable Member of the Senate she really is.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I want to commend the distinguished Senator from Mississippi on the remarks he made concerning the specifics of the space program.

It was my privilege, in the House of Representatives, to work for 6 years on the Space Committee there. The Senator from Mississippi is absolutely right on the importance of the specifics of the program he mentioned with which we have to go forward.

There is one point on which I should like particularly to compliment him on—and to reemphasize—and that is what he said in his remarks concerning sputnik and the orbiting by Russia of the first man in space, Yuri Gagarin. There is no question that they stole a propaganda triumph from the United States, the like of which has never been seen in the history of competition among world nations.

It took a long time for the United States to catch up over the years with the Russians, with that loss of prestige we suffered in the eyes of other nations, in technological and scientific capability.

I also point out the fact that, having built such a fine base for our space program, it resulted in the triumph of our landing the first man on the moon.

It seems to me now that that is surely added argument for further impetus in the space program.

Continually, over the years, the Russians have devoted a larger part of their gross national product, a larger part of their national budget, to space than we have.

Put it another way, they have given more emphasis on their space program than we have on ours, because they have spent more money on it proportionately to other programs.

Our competition is, indeed, the Russians, as the Senator from Mississippi has pointed out.

In our consideration of this space bill, I hope that we do not overlook that very important fact, for they mean business indeed.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Florida for his comments. It is fine to have the benefit of his reasoning and his considerable knowledge in this field.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I rise in full support of the bill now before the Senate for its consideration. It seems to me that in light of the fiscal and budgetary problems which have been brought before the Senate from time to time, this is a very well-balanced bill.

I join in the statements made by the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) in paying tribute to a great Senator, the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), who is chairman of the committee; and, likewise, to the ranking minority member, the distinguished Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH).

I am particularly pleased to pay tribute to my distinguished colleague (Mr. CANNON), who has been handling the bill on the floor in such able style. He has great expertise in this field, as he does in the field of armed services.

I should like particularly to comment on an item of great interest to us in Nevada because of the test site facility that is located there and is operated jointly by the AEC and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Nuclear Rocket Development Station.

For the entire nuclear rocket program I note that the budget request was some $36½ million, and that the House approved $50 million. I am delighted to see that the Senate has, in committee action, stayed with the House figure or the higher figure. I think it is completely justified.

I remember in earlier years when there were reductions, the cutbacks made serious inroads into the trained and scientific personnel we had at the test site in Nevada. Those men, once severed from their particular responsibilities in this field, left the area and were hard to replace.

I think we did build up a hard-core capability, and I trust that that higher figure of $50 million, which is the NASA part of that joint effort, will not only pass the Senate but that it will be expended by the administration.

My colleague is on the floor at this time, and he may care to comment as to the present recommendations of the task force appointed by the President of the United States, particularly so far as the rocket engine development is concerned.

If I am correctly advised, they have put great emphasis on moving forward in this area, because a nuclear powerplant is the engine for the missile and the rocket of the future. I would hope, as the fiscal situation clears, as it improves, that we could accelerate the program, because it is of top priority.

I am sure my colleague shares my view in that, but I would be very happy to have his expression on it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, first I thank my distinguished colleague for his very kind remarks, and simply point out that, with respect to the Space Task Group recommendations, three plans were presented. One of those is something of a crash program in connection with the Mars landing. Most will agree that is not wise at this moment. The other plans relate to increased manned space activity, establishment of space stations, and so forth.

As I stated earlier, if we are going to do this type of thing, then the NERVA engine is the most efficient way to do it. As an upper stage for large boosters and as propulsion for an Earth-Moon and orbital change "shuttle bus" NERVA will be particularly useful. Both developments have been recommended by the Space Task Group.

With the addition of the $13.5 million in the NERVA program—thanks to the very kind assistance of the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH)—we were able to adjust programs so that the total overall budget did not exceed the amount requested by the administraion. So in making our adjustments, we are coming up with the same amount, budgetarily, as the administration has requested. Of course, we have $250 million less than the amount provided in the NASA authorization bill already passed by the House.

I have no doubt that should the President determine to go ahead at a more rapid pace, the NERVA program, with the addition of this $13.5 million, will be directly oriented toward accomplishing the recommendations of the Space Task Group.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I appreciate that additional comment. I think my colleague will agree with me that our experience in Nevada, where we have this capability, was that every time there was a lessening of activity, we lost some highly experienced men. I would trust that by the passage of this bill we could prevent that in the future. I am delighted that the President's task force put emphasis on this program, as well as other programs. I wholeheartedly support the program and hope it will pass intact.

PLANNED SENATE HEARINGS ON LAOS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a story in the press this morning says the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER), plans to call for an investigation by the Committee on Foreign Relations "to determine whether American Armed Forces were already committed to combat in Laos."

Last month, when the able Senator proposed his amendment originally, I stated on the floor of the Senate:

> We have been at war in Laos for years and it is time the American people knew more of the facts.

What could have been a plainer statement? Therefore, and especially in that the Senator from Kentucky is a member of the Subcommittee on Security Agreements and Commitments Abroad, which subcommittee has already made plans to bring this matter before the Senate, I do not understand the reason for this story.

Let me take this opportunity to inform the Senate and the public at large, which has been aroused by recent press stories about fighting in Laos, that the subcommittee in question has scheduled hearings on that country to begin in executive session October 14. These sessions are part of a series of hearings which were planned last month; and which I announced on the Senate floor as long ago as August 13.

In July, two members of the subcommittee staff, Messrs. Walter Pincus, chief consultant, and Roland Paul, counsel, spent many days traveling in Laos gathering information on the U.S. programs and personnel in that country. I personally have visited that country several times in recent years.

As with our hearings on other countries, representatives of U.S. agencies active in Laos will be brought back from that country to testify first hand on the situation.

In this manner, the subcommittee will seek to put on the record as much detail as possible on our involvement in that country, along with the political-military agreements, understandings and commitments that have formed the policy basis for that involvement.

A matter as serious as our involvement in Laos—or any country for that matter—should not be explored hastily by the Congress on the basis of news stories. What is needed is careful preparation and that is what we have sought to do.

Let me repeat again. In discussing the distinguished Senator from Kentucky's original amendment on Laos and Thailand last month, I stated on this floor:

> We have been at war in Laos for years and it is time the American people knew more of the facts.

I hold to that statement today and assure both my colleagues and the public that, allowing for legitimate national security interests, as complete a record as possible on U.S. involvement in Laos will be made public following completion of our executive sessions.

For too long we have permitted our activities abroad to be carried on behind a cloak of secrecy—and often that secrecy veils such activities from the people in this country and their elected officials—not from the enemy.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 681) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 681) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 6508) to provide additional assistance for the reconstruction of areas damaged by major disasters, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS TO THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, 1970

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11271) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR FOR STAFF MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all staff members of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences be allowed floor privileges during the debate on this bill.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, for several years I have continuously studied the resources required for NASA programs. I have watched requirements for the national space program grow as we developed our capability for manned and unmanned space flights. I am not going to dwell here on the great achievements of NASA, as they are a matter of public record.

I have also observed the increasing maturity of the space program, and I have participated in the authorization recommendations in recent years which have progressively reduced the resources

available to the agency. These reductions, from $5.3 billion in fiscal 1964 to $3.7 billion, which is before the Senate today, a reduction $1.6 billion, or 30 percent, have forced NASA to continuously examine its many programs to effect economies.

It is clear that a very large portion of the NASA budget is devoted to manned space flight. This is very understandable. Manned space flight is a very complex undertaking. It involves huge rockets, complex space craft, superior management, technical skills, modern facilities, and brave and well-trained personnel. Nevertheless, manned space flights have been reduced from an allocation of $3.2 billion in fiscal 1966 to a projected $1.9 billion in the pending measure, as amended.

So it has become highly necessary to operate with reduced funding.

I am not going to recite the steps by which these reduced funding programs have been worked out, Mr. President, but I do want to make it clear that our committee has been fully cognizant of the fact that we should and must reduce the program; and this bill, together with the request of the present administration, clearly shows the determination to reduce budgets.

Our proposed bill covers exactly the same amount of authorization which is requested by the present administration in its reduced budget—namely, $3.7 billion plus, though there are some minor differences.

Mr. President, I am concerned about the fact that some of our distinguished friends feel as though there should be even further reductions, and that those reductions should be applied to the manned space program. If there has ever been any showing of intrepidity and of constant adherence to a fixed commitment which our Nation has made, and to the carrying through of that commitment until success has been attained, it has been shown in the progress of the manned space program.

Mr. President, I had the honor to go down to the cape at the time that the first manned space venture—the first Mercury shot—was scheduled to go off, and had to be postponed. I have been there at frequent launchings from that time until now, and I had the honor and great privilege of being present when the Apollo 11 blast-off took place.

I have seen the progress that has taken place. I have seen the intrepid way in which the astronauts have devoted themselves and dedicated their lives to this program. I know that nothing has happened in my lifetime—and I believe during the history of our Nation—which has moved our Nation quite so greatly as the success of the Apollo 11 flight, which, of course, followed those which had gone before.

Mr. President, I think we are inclined to overlook the fact that that terrible tragedy at the time of the testing of the Apollo 204 vehicle made many people think that we were at the end of the trail, and that we could not possibly accomplish the lunar landing by 1970. Many thought that it could never be accomplished. I remember the feeling of hopelessness which was reflected in my own mail from many of my constituents in areas surrounding Cape Kennedy.

Mr. President, there has been no more notable accomplishment in the history of this Nation than the return to progress and accomplishment of the program, which was marked, in July of this year, by the successful Apollo 11 flight, in which our three dauntless astronauts accomplished the purpose to which we had committed ourselves almost 10 years ago: to launch a flight which would result in a lunar landing in this decade.

Mr. President, we accomplished our commitment. We accomplished that flight; and now there are some who propose that, instead of recognizing the fact that we have several dozen very fine young men who have dedicated their lives to the further fulfillment of this exploration of the moon and of the program in general, we reduce still further the manned space program.

I want to make it perfectly clear, in the first place, that this program, as contained in the pending bill, reduces in considerable measure that program, in several ways. The principal way in which it is reduced is by the reduction of the frequency of flights. It was planned that the Apollo flights would continue, after Apollo 11, at the rate of about five a year. The reduced program—which is the minimum number under which real efficiency can be attained and preserved, in the opinion of the NASA administrators, who have certainly shown their ability—contemplates a minimum of three a year, which is what is embraced in the pending bill.

That is the greatest reduction which those who are most knowledgeable about this subject matter, the administrators of the program, feel can be accomplished, with a continuation of the present very great efficiency on the part of some thousands of people who participate in these blast-offs and in the following of the flights.

Mr. President, I have been a little disturbed to note that one of our most distinguished colleagues yesterday showed this feeling which exists in some quarters, by presenting two amendments, one of which has to do with the withholding of $300 million of the funds authorized for the manned space program for the Apollo flights, under the following words, which I am quoting from yesterday's RECORD. That part of the amendment which I think makes it clear what was suggested by my distinguished friend the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) is as follows. He proposed a new section 7, reading:

> Of the funds authorized pursuant to subsection 1(a)(1), $300,000,000 which has been earmarked for operations of the Apollo missions shall not be obligated or expended until the Administrator, in consultation with the State Department, has fully explored the possibilities of international cooperation and cost-sharing in space exploration, and has reported to Congress on the results of these efforts.

That is the meat of the proposed amendment; a reduction of $300 million in the manned space program until the State Department can explore further—and Lord knows we have had plenty of explorations in that field already—the ability of our Nation to negotiate a shared program with other nations, which would be highly desirable if it could be attained. We have been, of course, seeking in various ways to attain such a program heretofore, by which our Nation would join with the Soviet Union and with other nations in the completion of the lunar exploration program.

Mr. President, I think every one of us would say that would be wonderful if it could be accomplished. But to hold up the program and to reduce further the frequency of the Apollo flights, which have already been reduced by the pending bill and the new program of NASA under that bill to three flights a year, and hold it up indefinitely, would, I think, be a terrible blow to the program.

I understand that our distinguished friend from Wisconsin will probably not offer that amendment, and I rejoice that he came to that conclusion. But I would not want the record to be silent on this matter. To hold up the Apollo flights during the indefinite period when further efforts could be made, with the troubled international situation which exists now, to get joint backing of further lunar explorations by a group of nations, would simply be suicidal, in my opinion and in the opinion of the committee.

I would not want anyone to think that we frown upon any effort to get such international cooperation, but we try to be practical about the matter; and we know that the efforts heretofore made have not succeeded, and have no reason to think they will succeed in the future.

In the meantime, we know full well that the reduction of Apollo flights to three a year, under the present budget and under the pending bill, from the five a year which was contemplated, and the consequent reduction of personnel, is, in the opinion of those who know best, a definite blow at the safety of what we are attempting, as well as of the effectiveness of our flights.

Mr. President, what is it that we have ahead? Nine Apollo flights are scheduled. Nine Saturn V's are either constructed or are under construction; and the funds in the pending bill would permit the continued construction. Nine Saturn 1-B's are either under construction or are fully constructed; and the funds in the pending bill would continue that program.

It is planned to accomplish the nine additional Apollo flights because the mere fact that we have touched down upon one spot of the Moon and explored an area of a few yards around that spot of touchdown is by no means an indication that we know all about the Moon that man would like to know.

It would be just as if Columbus, having discovered this hemisphere, had gone back and reported it and thus satisfied the rest of the world with his report that the Earth was round, that there was a new hemisphere over here, that the road west was not a road which would lead to the edge of the Earth, and that man had not made further exploration or been ambitious enough to continue for 200

years or more with further explorations to discover just what was in the new hemisphere that Columbus had discovered.

I need not remind the Senate that although that discovery was in 1492, the first English-speaking settlement was in 1607, at Jamestown, a good deal more than 100 years after the discovery by Columbus, and that the next such settlement was in New England in 1620. I do not need to remind the Senate of the consent effort of the English and the Spanish-speaking peoples and other nations to continue the exploration, first, of the eastern part of the continent, and then all the way around South America to explore the western side of it. There was a continuous group of explorations for some 200 or 300 years.

In the case of lunar exploration, the planned operation extends only through the nine flights which I have mentioned, and at the very reduced speed provided for under the pending bill and under the new plans of NASA, which has cut its program as far as it can with safety.

Mr. President, the Saturn 1-B's are, of course, for use in the Apollo applications program. Ordinarily that would mean the use of those things which we have learned in the Apollo program, for the further informing of our Nation as to what are the qualities of our own environment and the close-in environment of space around the Earth.

Mr. President, the committee report supports those two efforts and expects them to continue, although at the reduced rate and reduced financing permitted under this authorization. I want it to be very clear that the report and the bill do not commit the Senate or the Nation to any manned exploration of the planets at their great distances. There is no commitment of that kind in the pending bill.

I believe that every member of the committee would feel it untimely even to consider what our commitment will be after the present planned program is concluded.

Mr. President, I am glad that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) will not continue his effort to cripple the manned space program, the Apollo landing program, as the amendment which I have read, in part, into the RECORD proposed to do.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin also offered for printing—and it is shown in the RECORD on page 26196—a further amendment. It reads as follows:

On page 10, line 14, strike "$1,691,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$891,100,000".

The Senator from Wisconsin said as to the purpose of that amendment:

Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is a simple one: It would close down the Apollo program.

Mr. President, I cannot think that my distinguished friend was serious, at least in that second amendment he suggested.

I am glad that he is not going to offer it today, as I now understand. However, I want to make it very clear that the committee, considering the exigencies of the Nation financially, has reduced the program. I am also glad to say that the administration is not asking us to commit ourselves to further exploration of outer space in connection with manned trips to the very distant planets. Those questions have to be reserved for the future.

In the meantime, let us continue and finish the matter we have addressed ourselves to and make a thorough exploration, or as thorough an exploration as can be made under the present program, of the lunar surfaces, so that we will really know something about the moon on a much fuller basis than is possible from the one trip we have made.

Mr. President, so far as the senior Senator from Florida is concerned, he thinks he is as knowledgeable about what has already happened to the space program as a result of this reduction in the budget and as a result of these reductions in our bills as anyone else, because he has a continuous flow of letters from Cape Kennedy.

Mr. President, I have a well considered article published in the newspaper Today of September 14 and I think it should be printed in the RECORD. It states what is already happening as a result of the cuts already made. 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:

CAPE CUTBACK CAUSES MORALE SLUMP

Skidding morale is plaguing Kennedy Space Center, where support teams are preparing Apollo 12 for the launch that will put the second team of astronauts on the moon.

Launch officials, however, expect morale problems to have no effect on the scheduled Nov. 14 launch.

The morale tumble is blamed on manpower cutbacks—more than 5,000 jobs by next July—and a psychological letdown, brought on by the success of Apollo 11.

The project manager for construction of Apollo ships calls the morale problem "a slight slip in desire." An official of the company that builds the Saturn 5 rocket's first stage says it is manifested in "a drop in efficiency." And an executive of the company that builds the moon landing craft terms it "a subtle reduction in alertness."

"Management's most critical job is to crank up the momentum and boost morale," George M. Skurla, base manager for Grumman, said.

John J. Cully, deputy director of the Saturn program for Boeing, said: "Our efficiency has dropped considerably in the last three to four weeks," because of layoffs and ensuing morale problems.

But looking toward Apollo 12, Cully said, "I don't think there's any concern about being able to do the job."

Officials say the psychological letdown represents the natural desire of workers to relax mentally and physically after the rigorous job of getting Apollo 11 started to the moon.

But the major factor in the dual problem is the extensive cutback in jobs, officials feel.

When Apollo 11 was launched last July, 23,600 presons were employed at the moonport. NASA predicts 5,600 of these jobs will be eliminated by next July.

The biggest portion of the cutback is occurring now, however, and most firms say they expect their reductions to be virtually completed by the end of October.

Still, some KSC workers are occupied with the possibility of finding other jobs and new homes. So supervisors have been ordered to watch for mistakes by preoccupied workers.

Bastian Hello, vice president and general manager of launch operations for North American Rockwell, thinks the payroll trimming will leave a better staff.

Technicians, protected by unions, generally are cut according to seniority.

"With engineers, however, we have used a different approach," Hello said. "You make sure you keep the most skillful people. I'm more confident on Apollo 12 because on any individual team we have more skillful people—more knowledge, intelligence and skill. We have the cream."

"The morale of the people remaining will pick up," Skurla agreed. "And when we come up to launch time, it will be just as good as it was on Apollo 11."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in order that I may give the real meat of the meaning of the article, it states:

When Apollo 11 was launched last July, 23,600 persons were employed at the moonport. NASA predicts 5,600 of these jobs will be eliminated by next July.

The biggest portion of the cutback is occurring now, however, and most firms say they expect their reductions to be virtually completed by the end of October.

The point of the article is that the Cape cutback is already causing a morale problem there. Some 5,000 persons at the Cape are now looking for new jobs. To cause a further increase in the problem of unemployment and a further impairment of the efficiency of the launching program, the article states—as do other articles I have seen in the press there and in communications I have had from NASA personnel and others—would be detrimental, because NASA has now adjusted to the condition, and even with the loss of more than 5,000 persons, it can still "run a good show." That is the position of NASA, the newspapers, and the general populace of that area of Florida.

I have before me an editorial from the newspaper Today, dated Wednesday, September 17. It was written by Mr. Homer Pyle and is entitled "No Room for Letdown." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

NO ROOM FOR LETDOWN

Kennedy Space Center officials report that launch support teams are undergoing a "psychological letdown" after the success of the Apollo 11 moon-shot.

Only natural, we might say, the temptation to rest on one's laurels.

It also is reported that the manpower reduction at the Cape, although anticipated, is causing a "morale tumble."

Understandable, we might say, since no one likes to see his friends and co-workers depart, especially when the same thing may happen to him.

A "drop in efficiency . . . subtle reduction in alertness" are the descriptions of the men preparing Apollo 12.

Only human, we might say, when the above factors are considered.

We might say these things, but we won't.

Actions of the past have taught us not to associate Cape workers with such everyday words.

Superhuman feats are neither natural nor understandable, but they have been performed.

And the situation now requires the mental discipline and professional pride to assure that they will continue to be.

Anything less is unacceptable, no matter how logical the reasonable may seem.

It's not that ours is a "what have you done for me lately" society.

It's that the recent successes in space which have spoiled us so much must be, as Astronaut Frank Borman described them, "an infant step into the future."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the editorial makes it very clear that the attitude of our good people there is not to have any letdown, but to insist that the efficiency of the force which is charged with the preparation for the launchings and with the launchings themselves be in no way impaired by the situation that has already resulted.

I bring this situation into the picture to show that already there has been a real and a very careful cut in the operation of NASA, and that NASA has adapted itself to the new situation and has no thought of doing anything else but to continue efficiently with the program.

Therefore, I deeply regret to hear some of our good people indicating that they think further cuts in appropriations should be made and that further reductions in personnel should be accomplished. To do so would cause a further impairment of the safety and efficiency of the manned flight program, which has been initiated in all cases at Cape Kennedy.

I shall not speak at great length, but I do want to make it very clear that I think the cuts made by the committee and by the administration were necessary under our present fiscal situation. They have been accepted wholesomely by NASA. NASA has adapted itself to the situation. In spite of its regret, NASA will accept in good faith what has been done and will go ahead with the program.

But the idea of further reducing, when substantial reductions have already been made and are now provided for in this authorization bill, is not justified. This is not a case of our authorizing more than the administration wants, or being faced with a question of whether the amounts authorized to be appropriated will not be spent by the administration, because it happens that the administration request and the authorization bill are in the exact same amount and that there are only a few small changes within the itemized recommendations which can easily be accommodated.

Mr. President, I would hate to see any serious effort made to reduce this already skimpy, this already heavily reduced program. I think that to do such a thing in the face of the grand accomplishment of those three fine astronauts on Apollo 11, and in the face of the fact that there are dozens of others who have dedicated their lives already to similar accomplishments, would be a rather cruel blow; and it is not the kind of sportsmanship that I would expect to see of the U.S. Senate or of the people of the United States.

I hope that the recommendations of the committee, as embraced in this bill, will not be in any sense reduced; and particularly do I make my remarks applicable to the manned space program, because that would be the most cruel treatment possible to those fine Americans who achieved the greatest accomplishment that Americans have ever made in the history of this Nation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Florida on the scholarly statement he has made concerning the space program. I heartily concur with everything he has said, and I join him in his recommendations.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I express my very deep thanks to my distinguished friend.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, as we debate the NASA authorization bill in the Senate, it is appropriate, I think, to comment on the guidelines that the Space Task Group has recently recommended to the President.

There is a wealth of measured wisdom in the summary of options proposed to the Nation in the guidelines.

Certainly, the short-sighted critics who have denounced our space explorations as extravagances without earthly values will find that the report to the White House provides them more with information upon which to reflect than targets for their scorn.

In addition, it seems to me we should be thankful for the tone of this document. Instead of calling for new, unprecedented efforts to take advantage of the pioneering voyage to the moon and back, a call which would have fallen easily within the acceptable limits of national modesty, the Space Task Group does not tell us what to do. Instead, we are told what we might do.

Moreover, each choice of action has been proposed with a vital and comforting thought in mind for everyone, even those who have been most virulent in their attacks on our highly successful space ventures.

There is freedom, and there is flexibility in the course we are at liberty to elect. And, it is most important, as I see it, for everyone to understand why this is so.

The options have been laid before us, because the programers have recognized that our priorities on earth might change.

The Space Task Group rejected the notion that the United States should protect its space leadership by adopting an all-out, gung-ho program to put an American spaceship and crew upon Mars sometime in 1981.

Instead, the report to the White House noted that there are divergent views about the Government's investments in space. It states:

These divergent views will persist and must be recognized in making decisions on future space activities.

This attitude, I would like to make clear, coincides with my own convictions on this question.

Like the Space Task Group, I believe that our exploration of the solar system must continue because, as the report says, the moon landing was a beginning, "not an end to the exploration and use of space."

Further, the Space Task Group has no quarrel with those who want to rebuild our cities, clean the air we breathe and the water we drink, and eliminate poverty. I certainly have none either.

Programs to maintain both our space ventures and our commitments to improve life on earth are necessary, and we are able to undertake them.

Moreover, they are complementary. What we achieve in space will directly benefit the existence of Americans on earth.

The report from the Space Task Group reminds us of this fact in even-tempered words. Future journeys to Mars and beyond, these experts say categorically, will return with "significant, direct benefits."

Among these blessings are new industrial techniques; increased national security; improved mastery of the life sciences, including medicine, as well as the physical sciences; improved international relations stemming from our willingness to share our space knowledge with others; and improved educational systems, thanks to improved methods of communications.

I do not believe that any thoughtful American is prepared to stand up and demand the abandonment of our space research. One excellent reason for keeping it going at the pace recommended by the Space Task Group is one that does not tax the imagination of the most uninformed layman.

This reason is employment.

Already the report to the White House reminds us that the total work force in the space program has dropped from 420,000, the peak period of activity in the days before the Apollo launching, to about 190,000 persons.

This indicates that unless we reorient ourselves quickly along the lines set before us by the Space Task Group, more than 200,000 specialists can be lost to this vital segment of the American economy. The cost of their replacement, the time and the money that would be involved in recruiting and training a new army of space workers, staggers our sense of realities.

As a nation, we must be guided and inspired by the message from the President's Space Task Group.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate, I am about to propose a unanimous-consent request.

It is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) has a number of amendments to offer. He has kindly agreed, and the managers of the bill have likewise agreed, that, if the Senate concurs, it would be possible to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement at the conclusion of his opening remarks.

Therefore, Mr. President, on that basis, I ask unanimous consent that an hour of debate be allowed on each amendment offered, the time to be equally divided between the manager of the bill and the sponsor of the amendment, and that an hour be allowed on the bill itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Reserving the right to object, how many amendments are there?

Mr. MANSFIELD. A couple of amendments.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I understood, in speaking to the majority leader, that on the first amendment, which will take the most time, we would have 30 minutes to explain the amendment and 30 minutes to a side after that; and after that, 30 minutes to a side, total time. But in the major explanation, we would have 30 minutes to read and explain every amendment, and then 30 minutes to each side, because several Senators want to speak for the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. An hour on each amendment and an hour on the bill, the time to be equally divided between the sponsor of the amendment and the manager of the bill, the time to start running after the opening remarks of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 128 to the pending bill, H.R. 11271.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I send to the desk a substitute for that amendment and ask that the substitute be reported instead. I ask leave to substitute this instead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the substitute amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The substitute amendment is as follows:

On page 10, line 14, strike out "$1,691,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,727,800,000".

On page 10, line 15, strike out "$225,627,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$354,827,000".

On page 10, line 20, strike out "$20,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$27,400,000".

On page 10, line 21, strike out "$128,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$138,400,000".

On page 10, line 24, strike out "$27,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$30,000,000".

On page 10, line 25, strike out "$33,550,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$35,000,000".

On page 11, line 1, strike out "$22,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$23,600,000".

On page 11, line 2, strike out "$20,250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$21,400,000".

On page 11, line 4, strike out "$36,950,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$39,900,000".

On page 11, line 6, strike out "$22,850,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$28,100,000".

On page 11, line 7, strike out "$77,700,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$80,900,000".

On page 11, line 8, strike out "$278,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$293,000,000".

On page 12, lines 3 and 4, strike out "$637,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$643,750,000".

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the modification reduces by $40,600,000—that is the only change—the amount of authorization by which we seek to increase the bill with the original amendment.

We have before us today for consideration H.R. 11271, an authorization for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1970. The purpose of my amendment is to raise the Senate committee's authorization to the amount of authorization in the House bill, less $40.6 million by which my amendment was reduced by the modification just offered.

As shown by the report which was filed with the bill, the Senate committee reduced the House action by some $256 million. The House authorized for the NASA program, for fiscal year 1970, the sum of $3,966,377,000. The Senate committee action cuts $256 million out of that, and would limit the authorization as shown by the report to $3,715,527,000.

Mr. President, all my amendment seeks to do is to raise the authorization to the House level, except that it would still be $40.6 million less than the House authorization. I wish to repeat that this is not an effort to raise the amount of the authorization beyond the House. Everybody knows how parsimonious the House was. This would merely restore part of the authorization that the Senate committee cut out.

Since its creation in 1959, I have been a consistent supporter of the NASA goals and the money which has been needed to accomplish those goals. In 1961, President John F. Kennedy set for NASA and for America the visionary goal of putting a man on the moon and returning him safely by 1970.

I heard people say that it was incredible and that it could not be done. People said we could not put a man on the moon and return him by 1970. In perhaps the greatest display of successfully combining the energies and dedication of its people that any nation has ever known, we accomplished this goal within the allotted time.

After having stated that goal in Washington several times in 1961, President Kennedy stated that goal again at Rice University in the summer of 1962. I heard him set that goal again on the 21st of November, 1963, the day before his untimely death, as he dedicated the School of Aerospace Medicine at San Antonio, Tex. Over and over again that goal was repeated. People said it could not be done, but it was done.

There can be no question that we as a country are committed to the peaceful exploration of space and our own planet from space.

But though the decision to continue the exploration of space generally is a foregone one, the questions of how and what rate we proceed are much more difficult and controversial. Where shall we go first? How fast? Manned or unmanned? Cooperatively or competitively? President Nixon's Space Task Group has recommended that we defer a Mars landing for a decade and concentrate our efforts on exploring and colonizing the moon and on developing large orbiting stations that can stay in space with several men aboard for long periods of time. These goals are the minimum we should set for ourselves in the coming decade. I want to make it clear at the outset that the moneys sought by the amendment before us are, in my opinion, absolutely necessary to make the attainment of these goals possible.

By "these goals" I mean the limited goals of the President's Space Task Group. My amendment would not contemplate going beyond the distance man has already gone, but just complete the job and the exploration.

We are at a crucial point in our space program. We have heard the Senator from Florida tell us how thousands of persons are being laid off in Florida and thousands of persons are being laid off at the Manned Space Center in Texas.

This is not just a laying off of workers who might be rehired tomorrow. This is the breaking up of scientific teams. It lowers the incentive for new scientists to enter the program. As they see the teams break up and progress slow down, they want to go where there is the greatest forward motion, whether it is in the Government or in private business. We may be slowing our space effort down to the point where it may be difficult to regain what we have lost once the difficult war in Vietnam is ended.

I wish to point out that if my amendment is agreed to, the total amount of money authorized by this bill will still be less than $4 billion. I point out that we spend $3.6 billion on the war in South Vietnam every month, some $36 billion a year.

If my amendment is agreed to, we will still be authorizing for this program less than one-ninth of what we are spending on a fruitless war in South Vietnam every year.

Although manned flight has been expensive, in this period of creating the most advanced capabilities, we have tried to maintain a balanced program in support of science, exploration, practical applications, and defense. Now that we have paid the price to build a broad capability, some people are saying that after one landing with a few minutes of walking on the surface of the moon, the time has come to disassemble much of our capability. We are dealing with complex operations which have a certain overhead of large supporting staff, or facilities for building, testing, assembly, and tracking which must be maintained if we are to fly at all. The marginal cost of each additional flight to exploit what we have built is minor compared with what it cost to erect this system.

A token pattern of space flights spread over a longer period of time simply is not practical, economical or logical. Either each flight would carry an inordinate burden of overhead with many idle hands through much of the year, or we would have to take shortcuts and skimp in ways which would court disaster in safety and provide minimal results. Now that we have the capability, we should proceed at a steady, moderately brisk pace while the teams are intact to learn what we can about the moon, and to pursue further work with these systems in earth orbit which will pave the way to wider applications in future space stations.

Much of the present criticism of our space program is grounded upon an analogy drawn from our experience with defense spending. But the analogy does not hold true if the purposes, budget history, and benefits of the space and defense programs are scrutinizingly compared.

While our venture in Vietnam has brought into question the fundamental

purpose of our military programs, no one can dispute that the basic purpose of the space program is one of peace. Indeed, there is every evidence that cooperative efforts generated by our space probes have substantially enhanced the long-range prospects of genuine cooperation and peace between the two great powers, who as deadly adversaries engaged in a nuclear face-down as recently as 1962. In this connection, Dr. Charles S. Sheldon, Senior Specialist with the Science Division of the Library of Congress, who is recognized as an outstanding authority in space diplomacy has this to say:

> In some sense, cooperation already exists. There is a considerable exchange of information at meetings of scientists and engineers, and data are filed at the United Nations. There have been treaties negotiated on excluding weapons from space, not making territorial claims to other celestial bodies, and rescuing astronauts.
>
> Further, there have been specific plans for trading of space-collected weather pictures over the "cold line" between Suitland, Maryland and Moscow. There is a joint effort underway to write a textbook on space biology. There has been some coordination of efforts on geomagnetism.

Mr. President, the analogy to the defense budget does not hold water for the further reason that there have been many drastic reductions in the space budget while there have not been drastic reductions in the defense budget.

I wish to point out that we spent $5.932 billion on space in the fiscal year 1966. The amount authorized in the committee bill would be $3.715 billion, only 62.5 percent of what we actually spent in 1966.

Mr. President, the present occupant of the chair (Mr. PROXMIRE) is one of the most knowledgeable men in Congress on governmental expenditures. I point out to the Senate and the distinguished occupant of the chair that this is a reduction of 37.5 percent from the 1966 actual expenditures. There has been no comparable reduction in the exaggerated defense spending. Defense spending goes up every year.

This scientific program of NASA and the discoveries resulting therefrom have been tremendous, and will benefit so many phases of our life, including medicine and many others. This is an exploration program. It involves the study of man, biomedics to learn about man. We have cut back 37½ percent on that also. My modest amendment would restore this figure to the level of a very thrifty House authorization.

We must recognize that year after year NASA and the Congress have been cutting the space budget.

The budget for NASA has been as follows: $5.425 billion in 1967, $4.723 billion in 1968, $4.249 billion in 1969. Now, the authorization proposed by the committee is $3.715 billion.

We must remember that the Appropriations Committee seldom appropriates the amounts authorized. We should authorize this and have the hope that the Appropriations Committee will stop the disassembling of the space program.

For an example of how the NASA budget has been reduced, in fiscal year 1968, $5.1 billion was requested and Congress authorized $4.86 billion; in fiscal year 1969, the request was reduced to $4.37 billion, and the authorization was reduced to $4.0 billion even. This is a reduction in both request and authorization in just 1 year of almost 20 percent of the budget. By comparison, while NASA was reducing its budget, the Air Force and the Department of Defense requested a net increase of over $515 million in the fiscal year 1970 budget over that for fiscal year 1969 for astronautical space and research and development programs.

In other words, the Department of Defense is asking for a net increase of one-half billion dollars in fiscal year 1970 over its 1969 fiscal year request for astronautical space and research and development programs. When that increase is compared to the Senate committee's reduction in NASA authorizations, it appears to me that we may be facing the beginning of a gradual phasing out of NASA and the transfer of our space effort to the Defense Department, thus turning it into a weaponry system. If this occurs, it will defeat the purpose of scientific exploration to which NASA has dedicated itself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a budget history summary of all NASA appropriations be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, third, let me mention just a few of the direct benefits of the space program.

The computer industry now provides our Nation with over 800,000 jobs, and has added $20 billion a year to the gross national product.

Mr. President, our modern computer systems were developed largely as a result of research by NASA. They had to have computers that could make hundreds of thousands of computations to be used in one flight.

The Mariner spacecraft has taken intriguing pictures of a part of the surface of Mars and has sent back valuable scientific data about our cloud-wrapped neighboring planet, Venus. That will be very valuable in the study of electronics.

Our communication satellites are commercially owned and are giving us routine coverage of world events on a regular basis, at a profit.

Worldwide weather coverage from space has reached operational status. Weather satellites are sending back valuable pictures of the earth's cloud cover and to weather stations on a routine basis.

This information alone would be of vast aid to the people of the world in the course of time.

Right now, we know that it aids us in forecasting hurricanes, where they come from, and where they are going. Pictures from space will help us to tell the people about these hurricanes so that they can leave their homes and go to a safe place. It will save many lives as a result of this research.

We all remember the greatest natural disaster in our Nation's history, which occurred on September 8, 1900, at Galveston, Tex., where 6,000 lives were lost in one night because a hurricane swept over the area without any advance notice to the people there. This research will prevent this from ever happening again.

Research by the U.S. Navy has provided the basic technology and procedures for first generation navigation systems utilizing satellites.

The Navy's transit satellites have demonstrated the use of space technology to provide both surface vessels and submarines with precise position fixes in all kinds of weather. Furthermore, these fixes are accurate within yards whereas celestial navigation involves possible errors of miles.

In the field of geodesy—a scientific discipline concerned with determining the shape and size of the earth and its gravitational field—more was learned in the first few months of the satellite geodesy than in the previous two centuries.

In the exciting new field of X-ray astronomy, celestial sources of X-rays were first discovered via sounding rockets and over 40 X-ray sources have been observed. The discovery of the Van Allen Radiation Belt was a major scientific achievement of our space program.

Pictures taken by our Gemini and Apollo astronauts with their hand held cameras reveal heretofore unrecognized geological features on earth of interest in the geological field.

Some Gemini photographs have been interpreted by geologists to reveal some promising possibilities of detecting oil and mineral deposits in remote areas of our globe.

Computer technology, power conversion systems, structural and fabrication techniques, as well as management systems, are benefiting as a result of our space efforts. There are new products and new processes, new companies and whole new industries.

The requirements of the space program for a worldwide communications network demanded major improvements in the state of art of computer technology. The computer complex at Houston that handled the Mercury flights performed 1 million calculations a minute. Today's Apollo system handles 50 times that many—50 million calculations a minute—80 billion in a day.

There are not enough people on this globe, if people had to do it, to feed that much information into a central source. There are not enough people on earth to individually make the vast number of 80 billion calculations in a day.

Lastly, I need not remind my colleagues about the dramatic disclosures made just a few days ago concerning the contents of the moon rocks and of the practical and scientific possibilities revealed by their analysis.

Mr. President, if people are ignorant about their environment, they are not apt to go very far or last very long. This knowledge about the moon is invaluable because it will help us to understand the planet on which we live. It will help unlock the secrets of nature, which will ultimately succeed in improving the lot of mankind.

The technological foundation producing these many benefits must continue to be strengthened and broadened. We are weakening them with this bill. We do not have surplus revenue to allow ourselves the luxury of a stop-and-go space program. A stop-and-go effort is the most expensive way of all to develop anything.

The present momentum of the space program compels us to authorize more money than is authorized in the bill now before us. Otherwise, we will be engaging in a tragic game of false economy. An example of this has been amply demonstrated in connection with the biosatellite missions. Unfortunately, NASA has canceled the remainder of the biosatellite program. Last December, the two 21-day biosatellite missions were terminated, and under the revised NASA budget submitted to Congress in April, one of the two remaining 30-day biosatellite missions was also canceled.

It has been estimated that cancellation of biosatellite F would result in at least $2,000,000 in unrecoverable hardware costs, and if an appropriate portion of the development costs of the 30-day satellite were assigned to biosatellite F, the amount of unrecoverable costs would be many millions more.

Another example is the research and development of an earth-orbiting space station and low cost transportation. The House voted $75 million for these projects. The Senate committee reduced this to the Nixon administration's request of $9 million. To me, this is a very unwise reduction. Whoever wants to be ahead in defense or wants to be ahead in military technology has got to be in the front in space. If we do not stay ahead in space, it is futile to think that we can, with the slow machines on earth, stay ahead in anything.

Mr. President, I was there when the Apollo 8 left last December for the moon on the first manned flight to the moon. I was there again last July when Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins left for the first moon landing. I saw the launching that cost $500 a pound to lift the rocket that had 7.5 million pounds of fuel in it, standing 34 stories high. I will never forget the size of that great machine, in the first light of dawn at Cape Kennedy in December of 1968, when it was dark and a great white light was around it like a beacon. And then as it lifted, the fire came out like a giant phoenix bird and it began to rise above the flames, very slowly at first, and then it seemed just to tremble and to suspend itself in the air. I told one of the engineers that I felt nervous, that I did not feel safe until it had got to the top of the gantry, and he said to me, "I never do."

At the time the bottom of that space rocket 34 stories high passes the top of the gantry, it is still going so slow that it is moving only at the speed at which a man can run on earth. Then it goes on, as we know, 5,000, 10,000, 15,000, 20,000 miles, gaining speed all the while until it eventually travels at a fantastic rate.

When that great space vehicle took off for the moon with Borman, Anderson, and Lovell in December, I heaved another sigh of relief. I said to another scientist, "I did not feel safe until it got to the moon." He said:

> I won't feel safe until the retrorockets fire and get them back to the earth.

So these scientists have as much in that program as the men who fly in the vehicles, but if we disassemble those teams we will have trouble getting them back.

The average cost today of putting a payload into orbit is $500 a pound, and those vehicles burn 600 pounds of fuel in the first few minutes.

We have the potential technology now, if we keep up with our research and experiments, of reducing this cost to $50 a pound. If we could, we would save $450 a pound, and cut the cost from $500 a pound to $50 a pound to lift the vehicle. But we cannot disassemble the research teams and continue the experimentations and succeed in getting the cost reduced to that.

There can be no question that we will continue to send satellites and ships into space. The American people would not support stopping that program. The American people are adventurous. They have seen enough of these flights on television and have had them explained to them in lay language, that they want to continue our space effort. But I do not believe the American people fully know the great benefits that can come to industry, science, technology, and our society as a result of these flights.

For an additional modest investment now, we can save substantial tax dollars in the future.

By the unparalleled combined efforts of Government, industry management, labor, the scientific and educational communities, and all taxpaying Americans, the vision of President Kennedy in 1961 has become reality in 1969. And what a remarkable achievement this has been. But the lunar touchdown is only the first step. Congressman MILLER of California in the debate on the floor of the House, with unusual articularity, explained why the Congress must not authorize less than that authorized by the House:

> Our logical next step will be the exploration of the Moon and to conduct other programs in near and far space.
>
> Lunar exploration is of the greatest national importance—for furthering our scientific knowledge, for determining the better potential for using the Moon as a base, and for demonstrating our international leadership in the exploration of space.
>
> The moon has particular scientific interest and potential direct benefits because of its close association to the Earth.
>
> A number of landings are necessary to establish an understanding of the origin, history, processes, and present state of the Moon and its relation to the Earth and the solar system.
>
> It is now expected that at least 10 landings will be needed at various distinct areas to gather data rquired for the major decisions on future uses of the moon.
>
> The other lunar landings will continue to increase our lunar knowledge from the experience we gained in each previous lunar landing. Production of the flight hardware for accomplishing these missions is being completed, the trained missions teams have been assembled, and following the first flight and on succeeding flights, precision landings will be made in different areas where significant economic features and important processes have been identified.
>
> At the same time, we must carry out our operations in a way that maximizes safety and effectiveness in an operational sense. A steady, reasonably spaced launch rate is the most economic and efficient use of facilities, hardware and personnel.
>
> Undue spreading or gaps in the sequence will result in major adverse effects in safety, reliability, costs, and maintaining of trained teams.
>
> The effect of delaying this project by inadequate funding will require that NASA fly missions that do not effectively use the hardware that has been produced in Apollo. Missions would be flown without surface science package, without provisions for extension for staytimes or increased astronaut mobility.
>
> The only alternative for this inefficient use of hardware would be to introduce an undesirable and costly gap in the flight sequence.

My amendment is simple. Except in two instances it increases the NASA authorization above that reported by the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences to the amount authorized by the House on each item where the House authorization was higher. Where the House authorization was lower the amendment makes no change.

Mr. President, I have modified my original amendment to reduce by $40,600,000 the total increase I had asked for. The cut relates to two items, the Apollo program and launch vehicle procurement. This reduction has become necessary because there has been a lapse of several months. We have cut it back because of the time loss.

My original amendment is modified to reduce the requested increase for the Apollo program by $39 million, which would thus make it $39 million less than the House figure. That $39 million is not needed now due to the rescheduling of the Apollo flights after the successful Apollo 11 launch. If the Apollo 11 flight had aborted, they were going to be ready with another. Since Apollo 11 worked so beautifully, they are not going to have to make the emergency shot and they have been able to otherwise reschedule their flights. That is the reason for the $39 million reduction in my original amendment.

The other reduction in my original amendment pertains, as I said, to launch vehicle procurement. I had originally asked for an increase in $1,600,000 for that item but that amount was for a Delta launch vehicle for the biosatellite program. Since launchings under that program have been canceled this increase is not needed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an itemized breakdown of these figures be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NASA AUTHORIZATION

H.R. 11271—SENATE REPORTED

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Research and development	Senate committee	Yarborough increase	
		Amount	Percent
1. Apollo	$1,691,100	$36,700	4.5
2. Space flight operations	225,627	129,200	56.8
3. Advanced missions	2,500		
4. Physics and astronomy	117,600		
5. Lunar and planetary exploration	138,800		
6. Bioscience	20,400	7,000	34.7
7. Space applications	128,400	10,000	7.8
8. Launch vehicle procurement	112,600		1.4
9. Sustaining university program	9,000		
10. Space vehicle systems	27,500	2,500	9.0
11. Electronics systems	33,550	1,450	4.3
12. Human factor systems	22,100	1,500	6.8
13. Basic research	20,250	1,150	5.7
14. Space power and electric propulsion systems	36,950	2,950	7.4
15. Nuclear rockets	50,000		
16. Chemical propulsion	22,850	5,250	23.0
17. Aeronautical vehicles	77,700	3,200	4.1
18. Tracking and data acquisition	278,000	15,000	5.4
19. Technology utilization	5,000		
Research and development, total	3,019,927	215,900	8.5
Construction of facilities	58,200		
Research and program management	737,400	6,350	1.0
Total	3,715,527	222,250	7.0
Authorization with Yarborough amendment, total		3,937,777	
House authorization		3,966,377	

Note: Yarborough amendment agrees with the Senate increases above the House authorization in 2 items: 4. Physics and astronomy $5,000,000; and 5. Lunar and planetary exploration $7,000,000.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. My proposed $36,700,000 increase in the Apollo program and $129,200,000 increase in space flight operations, the latter being a very substantial increase percentagewise, may be summarized as follows:

First. A total of $32.1 million has been proposed for reducing the cost of manufacture, assembly, and start of the Saturn V vehicle.

Second. A total of $4.6 million has been proposed above the Senate committee authorization for lunar exploration so that in flights subsequent to the lunar landing our astronauts may extend their range of exploration and spend additional time on the lunar surface and have sufficient equipment to allow a significant return of information of each flight.

This last item, $4.6 million, is not large. It is to permit further research and development of the space suit. The ones in which our astronauts walk on the moon are very bulky. Research is going forward on them. Without such a suit development, each flight will be more limited in time and accomplishment. This development is to give the astronauts lighter suits, with more flexibility, more mobility, greater possibilities of doing research when they are on the moon.

Space suits are absolutely necessary to sustain life in the vacuum of space. Oxygen and other elements are captured in each space suit, something approximating the environment here on Earth. The suit makes it difficult for the astronaut to move around, with the oxygen pressure, heat and cooling. NASA wants this opportunity to do greater research to enable spacemen to bring back more samples of minerals and other types of substance from the moon. The extra $4.6 million is for the development of a parallel, alternate means to increase the opportunities for future spacemen to be able to move more easily on the surface of the moon.

We have a great cost in building these machines, getting them to the moon, and here is a relatively minimal cost for creating an environment for man so he can do more once he is on the surface of the moon and get more and greater information from each flight.

We have all been stirred by the moon flight, but those who have been stirred more than anybody else have been the scientists of the world. I have flown with some of them since then. One will come up to me and say:

> I am a scientist from such and such a university. I wish I could get hold of a piece of the moon rock or substance.

The scientists of the world have had their imaginations stirred.

Third. The amended budget reduced the Apollo applications program by $57 million. Production of the last two Saturn I–B vehicles has been suspended and the start of the Apollo applications program has been delayed by at least 5 months. The availability of backup hardware for the Apollo applications program missions has also been delayed. However, the further delay of the Apollo applications program can only adversely affect our development of space for utilitarian gains and jeopardize the orderly development, in the 1970's, of a space station. Both the workshop of the Apollo applications program and the astronautical telescope mount will be our Nation's first major capability in a manned workshop and manned scientific observatory in space. For these reasons, the amount authorized by the House, which is $57 million higher than the Senate committee authorization, should be approved.

Fourth. The Nation has only two large payload launch vehicles—the Saturn I–B and the Saturn V. We have built 12 Saturn I–B's and we have completed 10 of 15 Saturn V's. Unless funds are provided for long leadtime items in this budget, the Apollo program will come to a halt. With the completion of the 15th Saturn V in 1970, even with the funds provided in this budget, Saturn V production will be stopped for 18 months and then restarted in 1973. Up to 42 months are required for some of the long leadtime items. The Nixon administration added $46 million for this effort, and based on testimony before the House committee, the House added $6.2 million above the Nixon budget for the purpose of Saturn V long leadtime hardware. My amendment restores these amounts, cut out by the Senate committee.

Fifth. The House, during this year's authorization process, received extensive testimony of the future of our national space effort in 1970. The desirability of developing large manned orbital space stations with earth oriented applications and the development of a low-cost reusable shuttle to travel between earth and space station were extensively examined. The early development of such a shuttle should provide a new era in transportation by being fully recoverable and therefore lower costs. The conclusion becomes inescapable that to assure an adequate national space effort and at the same time reduce the total cost of operations in the 1970 period, the early definition and development of both a space station and a low-cost reusable shuttle is of paramount importance. Therefore, the House added $66 million to the Nixon administration's request for space station and space shuttle design activity. It has been represented to me by some of the most knowledgeable people on space, that this item is the single most important activity for our Nation to assure an adequate space effort in the middle 1970's and beyond. My amendment would restore this amount to the Senate committee authorization.

Mr. President, we have heard it said that NASA has already adjusted itself to the reduced amount in the budget and in the Senate committee bill. Maybe they have. But that is kind of like a shotgun wedding. With the gun cocked and the pistol right against our heads, what else could we say? But I would refer back to Director Paine's statement of last October.

Dr. Paine said they needed more than $4 billion as a minimum to do this work. My amendment would bring the authorization up close to the amount Dr. Paine said was necessary. So, if we tell them, "This is all you can have, and you can't get any more," yes, NASA can adjust because it has to. But it means cutting back on the programs I have outlined, and many more.

Item 6: One of the largest reductions in the line items of research and development has occurred with regard to the bioscience program. The Nixon budget reduced the original NASA request for funds by $12 million. The House voted to restore this authorization, but cut $5 million in supporting research and technology funds for the bioscience program. This resulted in a new increase by the House over the Nixon budget of $7 million. The Senate committee cut the authorization by precisely that amount, which is a 34-percent deduction. My amendment restores this cut. More recently, because of the failure of the 30-day biosatellite mission, we are now left with no flight program at all, and still in need of the information which we had hoped to obtain. Since the objectives of the bioscience program are still of paramount interest, now, more than ever, funds are needed in ground based research so that beneficial results will be obtained when the biosatellite flight program is resumed. I consider that item of my amendment, restoring the $7 million, specifically for the supporting research and technology of bioscience, to be of high priority.

Item 7: The testimony before the House indicated that the space applications program should receive greater

emphasis. The earth resources survey project is of special interest. The House voted to increase, by $10 million, the amount requested by NASA for support of space application for fiscal year 1970. This would make available $24,100,000 for this purpose during the forthcoming fiscal year. The Senate deleted the $10 million increase, but I believe such a deletion would too severely restrict us in our efforts to capitalize upon our space technology in this important scientific area.

Let me repeat, Mr. President, that is the earth resources survey project, surveying the resources of this planet we live on.

This $10 million increase also includes $3,250,000 for the express purpose of accelerating the availability of ATSF and the development and procurement of 500 experimental rooftop antennas. This would permit the application experimentation to extend biomedical and educational communications to remote hospitals, clinics, and schoolhouses which are not, and could not otherwise be integrated into traditional networks of the United States, and thus increase the dissemination of learning and knowledge in the United States.

Items 10 to 14: My amendment seeks an additional $9,550,000 for the small conglomerate. The Nixon amended budget reduced the amounts sought for each of the conglomerate programs in the following amounts:

Space vehicle system	$2,500,000
Electric system	1,450,000
Human factor system	1,500,000
Basic research	1,150,000
Space power and electric propulsion system	2,950,000

After a careful review of the testimony concerning this program, the House restored these cuts, but the Senate committee eliminated the restoration. I believe we would be penny wise but pound foolish if we adhere to these cuts. I urge the Senate to authorize the amounts requested in the Johnson budget and approved by the House.

Item 16: For chemical propulsion, NASA initially requested $25,100,000. In the revised budget NASA reduced this request to $22,850,000. After extensive testimony on the subject the House added $5,250,000 for a total of $28,100,000, of which $2,250,000 was to restore funds cut by the budget amendment and $3 million is for an increase in large solid motor work. The evidence preponderates in favor of the 260-inch solid rocket motor program because of its inherent simplicity, reliability, and potential for achieving major cost reductions in payload cost per pound. The next major logical step in this program is the fabrication of a full-length test booster with a movable nozzle.

Item 17: NASA initially requested $78,900,000 for aeronautical vehicles. The budget amendment reduced this amount by $1,200,000 to $77,700,000. To the initial request of $78,900,000 the House added a modest increase of $2 million for a total authorization of $80,900,000 for use in structural analysis—mainly in helicopters; for vertical/short take-off and landing; and for vertical/short take-off and landing noise source analysis. The House also restored the $1,200,000 cut by the Nixon budget amendment. Therefore, the total amount recommended by my amendment for authorization is $80,900,000 for aeronautical vehicles, an increase of $3,200,000.

Item 18: For tracking and data acquisition, NASA initially requested $298 million, which was $13.8 million more than the fiscal year 1969 operating plan and $8.2 million more than was authorized. The requested increase was attributed primarily to increasing workloads of the three major networks: Satellite network, manned space flight network and the deep space network. The material submitted by NASA in their presentation before the committee generally supported the NASA contention that the workload on all of the networks in the tracking and data acquisition area will increase in future years, including fiscal year 1970, both as to quality and complexity of data to be acquired and processed.

The Nixon budget reduced NASA's request by $20 million. This reduction would result in: First, deferral of all planned improvements to the networks; and second, deferral of improved communications. Additionally, other reductions would be necessary.

Testimony before the House justifies real concern about impairing network capabilities. Taking into account the issues of improved efficiency and more intensive scrutiny of requirements being placed on the three operational networks an increase of only $15 million to the amended budget was made by the House. This action resulted in a recommended authorization of $293 million, which was still $5 million less than the initial NASA request. The Senate committee cut the $15 million added by the House and my amendment seeks to restore this cut.

Research and program management: For research and program management, the Johnson and Nixon budgets were identical at $650,900,000. The House cut this figure by $7,150,000 to a lower total of $643,750,000, and the Senate committee cut another $6,350,000 from the total. I believe the Senate committee cut is too sharp a reduction for our fiscal year and my amendment would simply reverse the reduction for research and program management $7,150,000 under the Johnson and Nixon budget requests.

Mr. President, I plead with my colleagues to support this amendment. The total increase in the NASA budget I seek is only 7 percent. And it comes out to less than the House of Representatives authorized. I seek to raise the Senate committee figure, but not by as much as the House-passed figure. We all know that I am not overstating the case when I say that this 7 percent could mean the difference in a bright and vigorous life or a slow and tortuous death for our space program.

Mr. President, I am not making this speech out of the clear blue sky. I have information on this. I am not going to call the names of the people who have given me that information; they might become part of the reduction in force. But these figures I have stated are based on the facts of life. For example, I have communicated with Representative OLIN TEAGUE, chairman of the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee of the House committee, who has termed an authorization of less than $3,800,000,000 a "going-out-of-business level of effort." The Senate committee's authorization totals only $3,715,527,000.

I have here an extremely incisive letter from Representative TEAGUE, dated September 10, 1969, which discusses in detail the many reasons why we should authorize what my amendment proposes. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read it now, Mr. President. I consider it unanswerable, but I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Chairman TEAGUE of September 10, 1969, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, to authorize less than $3.9 billion will necessitate an immediate breaking up of NASA teams and the costs of later reforming these teams, if we do reform them, will far exceed the amount it would cost to keep them intact while we explore the moon.

It is difficult to estimate the high costs of changing priorities in problems of technology. We have been through a major effort of building up a strong capability in space, investing not only much national treasure but also the careers of scientists, engineers, and workmen of America, and the capital of private companies to a certain set of expectations. We proved our capability to be foremost in the world in such an endeavor. Now if we were to disassemble these teams, we would return ourselves to the vulnerable position we fought against all the years from sputnik and Gagarin to Apollo. It would take time and money to reassemble teams and to repurchase or reconstruct factories. Also, we would have trouble recruiting top talent which once before had been led down the garden path, and then cast aside. Many would elect to stay in safer fields, less subject to Government whim. As Representative TEAGUE pointed out, for the last 18 months our aerospace industry has been declining in employment at the rate of 4,000 to 5,000 people per month.

Not only that, but when we blow hot and cold on major projects, we must take into account the long leadtimes involved in advanced technology. Time lost in certain aspects of development can never be made up at any price, even with overtime and incentive pay. The only way to protect the leadtime elements in the present modest program, already reduced to less than two-thirds of earlier NASA budgets, is to keep intact the program as planned, planning which was done with care over many years.

Mr. President, the Aeronautical and

Space Sciences Committee, headed by its distinguished chairman, the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), for whom I have the highest respect as one of the all-time great Members of this body, has, I am sure, done its best to provide NASA with a viable budget within the framework of the economic exigencies of the times. I want to compliment the committee on its hard work under such difficult circumstances. We know, from the remarks of the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND), that it is difficult to find a more knowledgeable man than he.

But the fact remains that we are faced with a choice: Whether to authorize a program that will constitute a phasing out of our initiatives in space or whether to authorize sufficient moneys to maintain our present momentum. In my opinion, we should by all means do the latter. The clear and present danger to our space program is eloquently characterized in the staff study for the Subcommittee on NASA Oversight of the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House:

> Finally, after an investment of billions of dollars in men and materials by the American taxpayers, the space program now has reached a stage of maturity where it appears possible that vast dividends can be returned to not only the American people, but to people everywhere, by prudently capitalizing upon the great investments already made. New and improved programs in communications, weather forecasting, navigation, and earth resources planning and utilization appear to offer enormous potential to the United States and to the entire world. Although the United States is just beginning to understand the unique ability of man to perform effectively in the space environment, NASA's Mercury and Gemini programs have demonstrated that many mission objectives can best be accomplished through manned space flight. There is the danger, however, that unless a commitment is made soon to take advantage of these unprecedented capabilities, the space leadership which has taken this country so long to develop could dissipate rapidly. The time has come to rededicate NASA to the exploration and exploitation of space for the benefit of all mankind.

Let me repeat, Mr. President, that what the House budget would do is less than two-thirds of what we were doing 2 years ago. The NASA budget is already cut more than a third since fiscal 1966.

While the amount of authorization my amendment would add is small, we have now gotten to the critical stage where everything hurts and any further reduction below the House figure would be critical.

What is important to us today is that the space program must bridge the gap of the next 5 to 7 years while the new generation of vehicles is defined and created. To hold together the teams and the national capability will require that we continue to fly our existing vehicles, carry out that overhead cost, while setting aside the necessary resources for the new systems.

All we have is kind of a holding operation today. It is an effort to hold what we have already done with reference to the exploration of the moon. Then, in the latter part of the 1970's, we can expect a smooth transition into the new age of regular space flight—a period which will see manufacturing in earth orbit, economical launch of unmanned scientific probes to other parts of the solar system, the economical maintenance and repair of earth-orbiting applications satellites, and further manned exploration, but at a far lower cost than we would pay with a stretched-out use of today's first-generation vehicles.

I reemphasize that no moneys are sought in this amendment for highly questionable excursions into deep space. Rather this amendment seeks to prevent a breaking up of the ship of space on the rocks of regression.

If we were about to embark upon some dramatic new space venture, I suppose my task might be easier. The task would be easier if someone were to say, "I have a new adventure. Let us go to Mars."

But we are at the undramatic hard-working in-between stage where we must follow up the glory of putting man on the moon with the less exciting, tedious work of exploring the moon. And we must preserve the integrity of NASA and the space program while we plan their future. And that is what this amendment is designed to do. It precludes stop and go; it prevents a gradual dismantling of the structure we have labored so long to build.

I would like to get a piece of the moon substance in my laboratory, if I were a scientist, to see if I could discover a new element. Think of all the new elements that science has produced over the centuries. Many scientists want to discover new elements. Who knows what elements will be on the Moon? Think of the benefits that such discoveries will mean to all mankind. Think of the benefits that have been bestowed already upon people from past discoveries. Think of how it has changed the lives of people and the manufacture of goods.

I recognize that the many demands for Federal funds make the reconciliation of priorities a grueling task. As I stated on the floor when this amendment was offered, my work as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has made me fully aware of the "extremely pressing needs of poverty, health, education."

I do not put that second to space exploration. I only ask for some stopgap measure to keep the project going and keep it from being disassembled.

The list of claimants on our fiscal resources is long, and many of those problems cannot be ignored or postponed. At the same time, I do not regard space flight as a rival, or an alternative, to solving the social and economic problems here on earth. Instead, I see space as a contributor and benefactor to the betterment of America, a stanch ally in our war on poverty, disease, and ignorance.

After Columbus discovered America, the people of Europe explored it. After learning how to split the atom, we spent hundreds of millions harnessing nuclear energy for constructive purposes. Let it not be said that after devising the means of transporting man beyond earth's gravity we failed to explore at least the near region of the spatial wilderness.

As we proudly listened last Tuesday, to the pioneers of Apollo 11, we could not help being inspired by the challenge of Astronaut Collins when he said that he hoped that the voice of the first earthling on Mars would be that of an American. Astronaut Aldrin eloquently recognized the significance of reaching the moon when he said:

> The footprints at Tranquility Base belong to more than the crew of the Apollo 11. Those footprints belong to the American people, and since we came in peace for all mankind, those footprints belong also to all the people of the world.

Man is instinctively an inquisitive being and it is inevitable that he will seek out the vast reaches of the universe to the very limit of his ability to do so. As the children of Maeterlinck's "Bluebird" sought the bird of happiness, man will forever seek whatever is unknown. While this solar sytsem cannot be reconnoitered in 1 fiscal year, nor perhaps even in 50 fiscal years, it is man's destiny to try to do so. Perhaps this is what Dante Rosetti meant in "Cloud Confines" when he said:

> Still we say as we go—
> Strange to think by the way,
> Whatever there is to know
> That shall we know one day.

Let it not be said that in the year 1969, this Nation, which in all its wealth, resources, and abundance, has a special duty to lead mankind in its quest for the unknown, began to turn away from the inexorable march to enlightenment.

Mr. President, if we turn away, others will keep up the march. Just because we are ahead is no reason to slow down and let other people continue with the exploration.

We were behind before. I recall when I was in the Senate in October of 1957 how the Russians put up Sputnik I a year ahead of us. I remember the shock waves all over America. We studied everything, even our educational system, to see why they got ahead of us.

Let us not turn our backs now. If we do, as soon as others get on the moon with larger vehicles, we will wonder why we slowed down.

I ask that my amendment be agreed to in the name of science and the many benefits that will be rendered to mankind.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of my very modest amendment. I urge the chairman of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences to reconsider. I hope that he will reconsider and see fit to accept the amendment if he has authority to do so on behalf of his committee.

I call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the modest amount asked for. It is even less than the House authorization. I hope that the Senate, with the consent of the other members of the committee, will reconsider and see fit to agree to the amendment.

EXHIBIT 1

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—BUDGET HISTORY SUMMARY
ALL APPROPRIATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Budget request	Authorization	Appropriation [1]	Obligations	Expenditures
1959 DOD transfer	146.6	146.6	146.6	298.7	145.5
1959	[2] 280.0	259.2	184.3		
1960	508.3	490.3	[2] 523.6	487.0	401.0
1961	964.6	970.0	964.0	908.3	744.3
1961 DOD transfer	2.7	2.7	2.7		
1962	1,940.3	1,855.3	1,825.3	1,691.6	1,257.0
1963	3,787.3	3,744.1	3,674.1	3,448.4	2,552.4
1964	5,712.0	5,350.8	5,100.0	4,864.8	4,171.0
1965	[3] 5,445.0	5,227.5	[3] 5,250.0	5,500.7	5,092.9
1966	5,260.0	5,190.4	5,175.0	5,350.5	[1] 5,932.9
1967	5,012.0	5,000.4	4,968.0	5,011.8	5,425.7
1968	5,100.0	4,865.8	4,588.9	4,520.4	4,723.7
1969	4,370.4	4,013.1	3,995.3	[4] 4,213.3	[4] 4,249.7
Subtotal	38,529.2	37,116.2	36,397.8	36,295.5	34,696.1
1970	3,760.5			[4] 3,878.0	[4] 3,950.0
Total	42,289.7			40,173.5	38,646.1

[1] Actual amounts appropriated, except the DOD transfers.
[2] 1959 budget request includes $20,750,000 R. & D. and $24,250,000 CoF for supplementals. Amount appropriated in 1960 includes supplements of $16,675,000 R. & D. and $21,825,000 CoF, against 1959 authorization.
[3] 1965 budget request includes $141,000,000 for proposed R. & D. supplemental. Amount appropriated in 1965 includes R. & D. supplemental of $72,494,000 against 1964 authorization.
[4] Estimate.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Budget request	Authorization	Appropriation [1]	Obligations	Expenditures
1959 DOD transfer	146.6	146.6	146.6	175.7	34.0
1959	[2] 90.9	70.7	50.5		
1960	345.3	333.1	[2] 347.6	307.9	255.7
1961	671.0	671.4	670.4	644.1	487.0
1961 DOD transfer	1.6	1.6	1.6		
1962	1,380.5	1,305.5	1,302.5	1,261.3	935.6
1963	2,968.3	2,957.9	2,897.9	2,878.6	2,308.4
1964	4,351.7	4,119.6	3,926.0	3,824.4	3,317.4
1965	[3] 4,523.0	4,341.1	[3] 4,363.6	4,358.6	3,984.5
1966	4,575.9	4,537.0	4,531.0	4,468.9	4,741.1
1967	4,246.6	4,248.6	4,245.0	4,249.3	4,487.2
1968	4,352.0	4,147.6	3,925.0	3,816.6	3,946.1
1969	3,677.2	3,370.3	3,370.3	[4] 3,460.1	3,520.1
Subtotal	31,330.6	30,251.0	29,777.5	29,445.5	28,017.0
1970	3,051.4			[4] 3,168.9	3,235.0
Total	34,382.0			32,614.4	31,252.0

[1] Actual amounts appropriated except the DOD transfers; excludes transfers between NASA appropriations.
[2] 1959 budget request includes $20,750,000 for proposed supplemental. Amount appropriated in 1960 includes a supplemental of $16,675,000 against 1959 authorization.
[3] 1965 budget request includes $141,000,000 for proposed supplemental. Amount appropriated in 1965 includes a supplemental of $72,594,000 against 1964 authorization.
[4] Estimate.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Budget request	Authorization	Appropriation [1]	Obligations	Expenditures
1959	[2] 98.3	102.0	48.0	38.0	24.8
1960	68.6	62.8	[2] 84.6	89.7	54.3
1961	122.8	127.8	122.8	98.2	98.2
1961 DOD transfer	1.1	1.1	1.1		
1962	333.1	323.1	316.0	217.1	114.3
1963	819.0	786.2	776.2	569.8	225.3
1964	800.0	713.0	680.0	546.6	437.7
1965	281.0	262.9	262.9	522.2	530.9
1966	74.7	62.4	60.0	270.4	572.4
1967	101.5	95.9	83.0	115.9	288.6
1968	76.7	70.0	35.9	64.5	126.1
1969	45.0	39.6	21.8	[3] 104.9	[3] 70.0
Subtotal	2,821.8	2,646.8	2,492.3	2,637.3	2,542.6
1970	58.2			[3] 58.2	[3] 60.0
Total	2,880.0			2,695.5	2,602.6

[1] Actual amounts appropriated, except the DOD transfer; excludes transfers between NASA appropriations.
[2] 1959 budget request includes $24,250,000 for proposed supplemental. Amount appropriated in 1960 includes a supplemental of $21,825,000 against 1959 authorization.
[3] Estimate.

Note: Fiscal year 1959 amounts include $29,900,000 authorized and $23,000,000 appropriated for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Obligations and expenditures include amounts obligated and paid out against unobligated and unexpended balances brought forward from NACA's "Construction and equipment" appropriation accounts for fiscal years prior to fiscal year 1959.

RESEARCH AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT [1]

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Budget request	Authorization	Appropriation [2]	Obligations	Expenditures
1959	90.8	86.5	86.3	85.0	86.7
1960	94.4	94.4	91.4	89.4	91.0
1961	170.8	170.8	170.8	166.0	159.1
1962	226.7	226.7	206.8	213.2	207.1
1963					18.7
1964	560.3	518.2	494.0	493.8	415.9
1965	641.0	623.5	623.5	619.9	577.5
1966	609.4	591.0	584.0	611.2	619.4
1967	663.9	655.9	640.0	646.6	649.9
1968	671.3	648.2	628.0	639.3	651.5
1969	648.2	603.2	603.2	[3] 648.3	[3] 659.7
Subtotal	4,376.8	4,218.4	4,1280.0	4,212.7	4,136.5
1970	650.9			[3] 650.9	[3] 655.0
Total	5,027.7			4,863.6	4,791.5

[1] Formerly titled "Administrative operations."
[2] Actual amounts appropriated; excludes transfers between NASA appropriations.
[3] Estimate.

Note: Fiscal year 1959 amounts include $80,500,000 authorized and $78,100,000 appropriated for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Expenditures include amounts paid out of unexpended balances brought forward from NACA's "Salaries and expenses" appropriation accounts for fiscal years prior to fiscal year 1959.

EXHIBIT 2

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE
AND ASTRONAUTICS,
Washington, D.C., September 10, 1969.

Hon. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: Your recent letter on our national space program posed significant and far reaching questions as to where we stand and where we are going in our national space effort.

I shall try from my own point of view as Chairman of the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee of the Committee on Science and Astronautics to discuss some of these important issues which you have raised.

I share with you the great pride that we all have in the achievement of Astronauts Armstrong, Collins and Aldrin in the achievement of the lunar landing on the Apollo 11 flight. Only a few years ago when the Russions launched the first Sputnik and our national space program was started, belatedly, in earnest, it was difficult to foresee the accomplishment of this stupendous achievement. Even as the Apollo Program contributes to our international relations, our growth of technology, benefits education and industry, many people do not realize that our technological base in the space program is rapidly eroding. For over 18 months our aerospace industry has been declining in employment at the rate of 4 to 5 thousand people per month. Our skilled technological teams in government and industry are in jeopardy of decimation. As you well know our country has thrived in the capability to remain in the forefront of technology. Today we stand in a position where we can likely lose our greatest technological momentum from the space program which is finding its way into all sectors of American life.

Since 1966 our expenditures for space by NASA have declined from approximately $5.9 billion to less than 4 billion in FY 1969. It is interesting to note that in our highly scientific and technological industry today it is considered that investments at the rate of $30 to $40 thousand per man year are necessary to generate the products and programs of these industries. At the current planned funding level of FY 1970, the expenditure for these activities through NASA will have declined to a level of $17 thousand per man year. This level of effort is barely enough to keep the basic know-how intact. In fact, at this level it is likely that degradation of our capabilities will take place. Dr. Thomas O. Paine, before the House Appropriations Committee considering the FY 1970 NASA appropriations budget, stated that an expenditure of less than $3.8 billion in our national space program for the Fiscal Year would be a going-out-of-business level of effort. It is significant to recognize that NASA's budget request to the Bureau of the Budget for FY 1970 was $4.69 billion. The budget request prepared by the Johnson Administration and submitted in January of this year was $3.76 billion and the amended NASA budget for the same period submitted by President Nixon was $3.72 billion. These figures speak for themselves as to our current position in our national space program.

The Apollo program has required an investment of nearly $24 billion to achieve a lunar landing. The total expenditures for NASA for all programs since 1959 are slightly in excess of $38 billion. We stand at the crossroad as far as our future in space is concerned. The opportunity exists for us to capitalize on this large investment that has been made by the American people.

Much has already been achieved in the area of communication satellites, weather observation and forecast and to some extent navigation utilizing satellites. By this initial in-

vestment it has been made clear that space not only will add new knowledge but provide a new avenue of commerce which should be exploited along with further scientific exploration in areas such as oceanography, ship and aircraft navigation and earth resources surveys. The future space effort can provide a wealth of utilitarian benefits to our nation and to the world. Even in such areas as communication, weather and navigation we have only begun to scratch the surface of space opportunities that lie before us.

We have available to us today a large trained scientific team capable of providing a return on our investment that we have made in our national space program. We have an aerospace industry with the tools and the know-how available to reach into the future and we have an in-house scientific and management capability in the government-NASA team which can competently manage these undertakings. What we must have in my view is the will and the commitment to proceed.

At the present time NASA is continuing the Apollo Program to conduct lunar exploration operations. Significantly, in 1972 NASA will launch a large earth orbital workshop on a Saturn V vehicle. This workshop will be the precursor of space stations which can be built in the mid 1970's. It is with these programs that the next near term steps in manned space flight will be taken. In addition to this a number of flybys of planets in the solar system will be made with automated vehicles in the early 1970's. These programs, although well conceived and underway, are not enough.

Among the near term opportunities that are available to us I believe that we first should look to the development of a low cost space transportation system most often called a "space shuttle". Such a system developed by the mid 1970's would sufficiently reduce the cost of travel into earth orbit to allow the establishment of a large space station to accomplish a number of the items which I enumerated above. Such a system will not require the large investment that was made in the Apollo program but would utilize the technology developed in that program and would allow the kind of planning necessary to gain full utilization of the remainder of the Saturn V and Saturn IB launch vehicles that are available. Such a shuttle system would be operated much like an aircraft in that it would fly into orbit and return. Because it can be used many times it could be an economical transportation system.

In addition to this, I feel that we should proceed with the development of a nuclear propulsion stage. Here I believe we can learn from the experience of our aircraft industry over the past several decades. In every case major improvements in propulsion systems for aircraft have occurred before the development of the aircraft system itself. Nuclear propulsion promises to open new avenues for our space activity providing a shuttle system between earth and the moon if it is found necessary to establish long term bases on the moon or as a deep space vehicle for expanding our knowledge of the universe and eventually allowing man to traverse deep space.

I also feel that we should continue our deep space automated exploration of the planets. In the last 1970's at a relatively low cost it will be possible to send vehicles to fly by and investigate in a limited number of missions a number of planets in the solar system. These planets, as I understand from astronomers are only in conjunction once every several hundred years. Such an opportunity will be available in the late 1970's and should yield a major scientific return at minimum cost if we seize the opportunity to build and fly automated spacecraft to gain a close look such as we did recently with Mariner 6 and 7 to observe Mars.

It is my conviction that if we undertake these activities in the 1970's and continue our current program of lunar exploration we will have a strong and progressive national space effort. I am firmly committed to the idea that if we choose to be a second rate nation in space that we could easily become a second rate nation technologically and that the wealth of benefits that can be gained from an effective national space program will be left to those who have the foresight to undertake this effort.

I have only briefly touched on the many benefits that our nation and the world have already derived from our national space effort. Our industry and our daily lives are constantly being affected by the products and resources of our national space effort. Even the management of our industry today have learned much and are learning much from the management of our national space program. Our youth have a new inspiration and example. The knowledge that we have gained from our space explorations in the last decade has overshadowed much of the total effort in science and technology in the past century. The international implications of our national space effort, particularly following the flight of Apollo 11, are obvious.

Surely we cannot turn our backs on the need to maintain our national space effort. We must stop the decline of our capability in space at a time when its achievements are just becoming generally apparent to our nation and the world.

I hope my comments on your questions will be helpful.

Sincerely,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is now under control, one-half hour to each side on the amendment.

Who yields time?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 10 minutes?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I fully support the Yarborough amendment.

Mr. President, a few weeks ago, the entire world watched as an American became the first man to set foot upon the moon. While there is no way to assess the far-reaching effects of this magnificent feat, it certainly can be said that this was the greatest outstanding single achievement in the history of the world.

Mr. President, for the past 2 to 3 years, it has been politically popular for a few to try to shoot down the space program. The arguments range from cynical remarks about bringing back cheese from the moon to cries that if we were not spending so much money in space, we could solve all our problems here on earth.

I fail to see how shorting the space program of money can solve our domestic problems. We are already spending over $22 billion a year in Federal aid in welfare. The space program costs less than $4 billion annually, less than one-half of 1 percent of our gross national product.

By hurting ourselves in an area where we now lead, we will not only not solve our economic and social problems but we will lose the qualities that will one day enable us to solve them.

We all recognize that the United States today faces many problems that require money and that also the need to limit Federal spending is great. In view of this need, and in the wake of the success of the Apollo 11, it is especially important now to establish the direction and goals of the Nation's future space program.

Mr. President, in the bill before us today there is no manned space flight program beyond 1973. The current NASA program provides for three launches per year utilizing the remaining nine Saturn vehicles. Apollo Applications as currently planned will include the flight of one S4B tank workshop as a forerunner to a space station. This means that under the current plan, we will have no manned space flight program after 1973.

Studies alone—and they are provided for, of course, in the bill—will not provide the research and development nor the hardware and experience necessary for a balanced space program in the 1970's.

We cannot continue just to maintain options, which is all this bill does as far as manned space flight is concerned, while our resources to accomplish these options are rapidly eroding. Mention was made in the debate earlier about thousands of workers who have been laid off in their respective areas in the space program. That has been especially true, of course, in Florida, at the Cape, an area of the State I used to represent in the House of Representatives. Indeed, our State's program is eroding, so far as our technicians, our scientists, and our engineers are concerned.

The NASA authorization of $3.715 billion which we are considering today represents the barest minimum to maintain ongoing programs. Even this amount may not provide a maintenance level. The thing we ought to note here, and what is important in the Yarborough amendment, is that this budget includes no big new goals and no new starts. In fact, a further reduction would represent a phaseout approach rather than a balanced effort to continue our present momentum.

President Nixon's revised budget held open options for future Saturn V production and provided funds for lunar exploration. Subsequently the President appointed a space task force to recommend goals and objectives for our space effort in the 1970's and early 1980's. This study, with its conclusions and recommendation, has now been released by the President. The proposed Yarborough amendment, which I am cosponsoring, anticipates these recommendations. Briefly, the President's Space Task Group report concludes that we are at the beginning of long-term exploration and use of space by man and that exploitation of space is within our capability. The report concludes that we have the national resources and the capability to seize these new opportunities to advance science, engineering, international relations, and enhance the prospects for peace.

Under the general goal of a manned Mars mission in this century, the Space Task Group has endorsed, in addition to other specific objectives, a new space transportation capability and a space station system.

The budget before us is $250,850,000

less than the amount authorized by the House. Now that we have the benefit of the President's Task Force Group study, it is my view that the Yarborough amendment restoring the budget to more nearly the level of the House authorization does provide a more balanced space program.

Unlike any other Federal agency, NASA has absorbed a cut of half a billion dollars a year within the last 3 years.

As a matter of fact, I did some studies on this last year, and it is the only Federal agency in the last 3 years that has continually had a less percentage of the national budget. Others have had an increasing amount.

These reductions have not only forced cancellation or deferral of many important projects but also have increased the long-range total cost of many of the programs. Because of the long leadtime required for major space programs, the impact of these reductions will not be visible until the early 1970's.

Mr. President, our defense budget is now running at a cost of $77 billion annually. We certainly explored that in full in the last 2 months. We are fighting a war against communism in Vietnam at a cost of $25 billion annually. We have spent $171 billion in foreign aid since World War II. Every single dollar of defense spending, or Vietnam spending, or foreign aid spending, is directly related to our national goal of survival.

We spent a total of $23.9 billion going to the moon. It is my firm belief that a strong argument can be made that these dollars are more than equal in value for goods received, in the constant struggle for the good will and friendship of peoples around the world, as any defense dollars or any foreign aid dollars.

There are many arguments for the importance of practical fallouts from the space program in the field of communications, weather reporting and prediction, navigation and mapping, new products and a host of other contributions, tangible and intangible.

However, if none of this had occurred at all, I am convinced that the prestige which the United States has acquired throughout the world by virtue of its Apollo 11 moon voyage is alone worth the money we have invested and expended.

There are four major goals to be performed. One, to further manned space flight for long periods in close to the earth orbit to prepare us for longer space voyages. Two, more scientific exploration to unlock the secrets of the universe. Three, a manned space flight to Mars. Four, unmanned explorations of the rest of the planets in the solar system.

Not all of these goals can be accomplished at once and simultaneously, nor is there any thought that they should be. Properly scheduled, they are all possible within the financial capability of the United States. We should map right now an orderly space program to carry us through the next two decades of the 1970's and the 1980's. We can do this and spend considerably less a percentage of the gross national product of this Nation than we did in accomplishing the Apollo program.

To set our goals for anything less, would deny our heritage and cast aside and abandon the never-failing adventurous spirit of our Nation and its people since the first settlers came to this land over 350 years ago.

It is for the administration to set the goals, but it is just as important that Congress, as the representatives of the people, back the administration in an ongoing, adventurous, and productive space program, that is representative and reflective of the United States of America and its heritage of exploration, and breakthrough in science and engineering and technology.

That is why I support the Yarborough amendment. I think it is especially necessary to carry on the portion of the increase in funds which is in the House authorization bill and which is contained in the Yarborough amendment, particularly in the manned space flight portion of it. There is no money for further manned space flight after what we have on the program now, with the remaining Saturn 5 shots.

There is a little money for study, yes; but studies have been made year after year; and unless we put some real money in this thing to do more than the studies and to get some hardware, we are going to be out of business so far as manned space flight is concerned in the 1970's.

One thing that has always impressed me, as a close observer of the space program in the House of Representatives, where I worked with it for 6 years on the House Space Committee, was the tremendous emphasis our competition, Russia, put on its space program. They have always striven to maintain the lead over us that they acquired with sputnik and putting into space the first man. We overcame that lead over the years, but they still devote a larger portion of their national budget to space, proportionately, than we do in our budget, which indicates the great emphasis they place upon space, because they realize the importance it has—that the first nation in space is going to be the first nation on earth.

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

Mr. GURNEY. I back the Yarborough amendment, and I hope the Senate does.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has concluded.

Mr. CANNON. I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. President, the amendment of the senior Senator from Texas would add $222,250,000 to the NASA fiscal year 1970 authorization.

One of the major problems with any large endeavor that is as broad and as rewarding as our national space effort is a chronic lack of funds to do everything that people would like to do. There are many things that could be done in our space effort that we are not doing. The committee has heard testimony many times that cutbacks such as NASA has been experiencing during the last 5 years are not the most efficient and economical way to achieve results.

There is no doubt that NASA could use more money and use it efficiently. However, at the present time, with the heavy pressures and expenditures resulting from other demands on the budget such as the Vietnam conflict, large new programs, and the current inflationary trend, your committee believes that the most prudent course the Senate can follow is to accept the well-reasoned and carefully considered plan that the President submitted for NASA and that your committee is recommending.

As all of my colleagues know, there have been some classic cases where the Congress has insisted that the executive branch spend more on certain programs than had been requested. There have been only rare exceptions when the Congress succeeded in this endeavor. In the overwhelming majority of these cases the executive simply refused to spend the money. There have been no indications from the President that this year's space bill would be one of those rare exceptions.

Since the Senate committee acted on the bill, the Appropriations Committee in the other body has likewise acted on the House authorization. The appropriation bill as acted upon by the House carries $18.54 million less than the Senate authorization as reported by the committee. It would simply be an exercise in futility for the Senate to say we are going to authorize an incerase of $222.2 million over and above the amount carried in the bill. For these reasons and although many of the things the Senator from Texas has said are correct, I must oppose giving NASA any authorization over and above what the committee is recommending.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Maine.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, increases similar to those contained in the amendment before us were considered by your Space Committee during its deliberation of the bill. The increases were rejected in each instance, after due consideration.

I refer my colleagues to the committee report on the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1970.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge that the amendment proposed by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EAGLETON in the chair). Who yields time?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back my time if the Senator from Texas is.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On whose time does the Senator suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. On my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. 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. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, we are called upon to vote on the authorization for NASA in the amount of $3,715,527,000 as recommended by the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Mr. President, the recommended authorization is $250,850,000 less than the amount authorized by the House it is $45 million less than requested in the President's original budget it is $435 million less than recommended by the committee in the last fiscal year and it is the lowest total amount recommended by the committee since 1962. It provides funds only for minimal progress toward increasing the scientific, technical, and economic return on the Nation's investment in the space program. In my judgment the Senate should restore the $250,850,000 as passed by the House. The Yarborough amendment does not go that far however.

Mr. President, what is the fundamental question here? As I see it our Nation is faced with a truly unique challenge. I believe most sincerely that we are asked to fund a search for the key to our future on earth—as well as our past.

For this reason, Mr. President, the question before us is more than a question of the wisdom of increasing or decreasing the amount of authorization for an ordinary governmental function. I wish that the decision were that simple. But it is not. We are not dealing with an economic question, as such, and for this reason we will not be guided in reaching our decision merely by reference to economic symbols, or words or phrases or ideas.

But, of course, there are many economic and humanitarian benefits that can reasonably be expected from an adequately funded space program. As of today, there are not less than 2,500 new products on the market resulting from technological development in the space program.

The computer industry is largely the result of demands created by space programs and is today a $20 billion industry in America and employs close to 800,000 people. This means, Mr. President, that a single industry which owes its existence to the space program accounts for 1 percent of the total working force of America today. What can we hope for tomorrow?

From a different standpoint the development of satellites has translated the dream of global communication into a reality; it has provided the means for weather observation, the beneficial results of which are only beginning. But it has already provided an early warning system for weather disasters and has saved innumerable lives. Soon these satellites will be inventorying the world's great natural resources.

Miniature television sets have been developed which weigh slightly over 1 pound and hundreds of applications await in the scientific, industrial, educational, medical, and communications fields.

In the medical field, ingenious instruments have been developed which measure physical reactions of individuals thousands of miles away; new sensors have been devised which are capable of detecting cancer and Parkinson's disease; the astronaut helmet has been adapted for treatment of asthmatic children; the lunar walker has been adapted for paraplegics; new heat resistant paints have been developed which will revise the system of painting our homes, paint that will neither crack nor peel and will endure for years and years.

These are but a few of the thousands of applications of our space science technology which have economic and humanitarian implications. But the thing to remember in this regard is that we are merely standing at the threshold of vast new areas of economic and humanitarian benefits which await the harvest. We have only begun. All mankind will reap the benefits.

While the economic rewards of full funding of NASA are exciting to contemplate, they simply pale into insignificance in comparison with the intangible rewards which can be described only in terms of the human spirit and human aspirations.

No, Mr. President, the fundamental issue is not economic but rather one of national aspiration. It is not one of fiscal and monetary policy but one of national will and national determination. It is a question of a nation's inherent capacity to respond to or shirk from the challenge of national greatness.

The challenge before us is presented in a universal language of all races, of all creeds, all colors, and all nationalities. It is the language of science, and its message is one of hope and faith, and it is addressed to the eternal and universal quest of man for knowledge and truth and light and wisdom.

This quest, Mr. President, is the unifying force in the world which has been activated by the space program. It has introduced a new perspective and new values to shape the thinking of all men and it has awakened new aspirations and new dreams and new hopes which now pervade the consciousness of all who can comprehend the significance of our dramatic breakthrough to the frontiers of space.

Mr. President, it is our privilege at this time and point in history to respond to the call for national greatness which paradoxically transcends traditional concepts of nationalism. For in funding a program dedicated to the exploration of the frontiers of our universe—every man, woman, and child on this earth has a vital interest, and the knowledge gained from these efforts will never be confined by national boundaries. One might even reflect and marvel at the combination of circumstances which makes our national assembly the appropriate forum for fixing the goals and funding an enterprise so overburdened with universal interest and concern and meaning.

But, Mr. President, this is the forum. The decision is ours. It is unfortunate that none of us can clearly foresee the ultimate consequences of our decision but it is certain that the effects of the decision for good or for ill will help shape the lives of unborn generations.

Needless to say, a question of such importance will not permit our judgments to be impaired by consideration of partisan politics; nor by ideological rhetoric and debate concerning narrow and transitory domestic problems.

All of these considerations are grossly and fantastically inappropriate to the issue. Faith in the future is not for sale, the value of creative genius is not measured in dollars, heroism is not bought. We have these at our command. We are asked to set a goal; to provide the funds to keep intact the talent and ingenuity of our scientists and engineers; and to demonstrate our faith in a shared vision.

Mr. President, the very least we can do is to vote for the authorization recommended by the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

But we should not be satisfied with the least that we can do. We should not be satisfied with providing funds merely for minimal progress toward increasing the scientific, technical, economic, and humanitarian returns on our Nation's investment in the space program.

Mr. President, I support the Yarborough amendment and urge the Senate to adopt it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY) and the distinguished Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) for the very fine and forceful statements they have made here. They have given the answer to the chairman of the committee. We recall, at the meeting, that he yielded himself time to argue that this amendment should not be adopted because the appropriation of the House was only so much.

It is the authorization committees of the Congress who have the duty of determining how much is needed to do a particular job. The Appropriations Committee, on which I sit, takes in appropriations to see how much money they have to spend and determine how much they can allocate to each one. It is not the province of the appropriation committee to determine need. That is the province of the authorization committee, to determine need, whether there is money enough or not. I point out that in fiscal year 1968, appropriations never kept up with authorizations. An authorization is for need. We put the cart before the horse if we say that because the appropriations from the House are only so much, therefore we should not authorize more in the Senate.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield on the Senator's own time.

Mr. CANNON. The Senator just mentioned the responsibility of authorization committees to make determinations of how much is needed. That is exactly what the authorization committee has done in this instance; namely, to submit

a determination as to how much is needed. We came out with that determination. A unanimous recommendation was made, and not one member of the Senate authorizing committee supported the Senator's amendment.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It is interesting to note that there is broad-based support for the amendment, as the Senator knows, from the people who cosponsor it. One Senator, who planned to be here, could not be here. The senior Senator from Alabama, as well as the distinguished Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN), who has just spoken, support this broad-based amendment. We say it is unsound for an authorization to be based only on what the House has appropriated. The word is "pioneering." We tell the Appropriations Committee what is needed.

Mr. President, in the past it has been true that the Committees on Appropriations, with their hard look, have cut back the authorizations. If we are to base our authorizations on what the House has appropriated, we will surely liquidate the space program in a hurry. That is the cutback way. That will cause a faster cutback than even the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences has recommended.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I desire to have the RECORD show that I voted against the amendment offered by the able Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas (putting the question).

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I offer another amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be discontinued and that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 10, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "$225,627,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$291,627,000".

On page 10, line 20, strike out "$20,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$27,400,000".

On page 10, line 21, strike out "$128,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof $138,400,000".

On page 10, line 24, strike out "$27,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof $30,000,000".

On page 10, line 25, strike out "$33,550,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$35,000,000".

On page 11, line 1, strike out "$22,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof $23,600,000".

On page 11, line 2, strike out "$20,250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$21,400,000".

On page 11, line 4, strike out "$36,950,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$39,900,000".

On page 11, line 6, strike out "$22,850,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$28,100,000".

On page 11, line 7, strike out "$77,700,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$80,900,000".

On page 11, line 8, strike out "$278,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$293,000,000".

On page 12, lines 3 and 4, strike out "$637,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$643,750,000".

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the amendment would authorize an addition of $116 million to the committee bill. It cuts in half the amount of additional authorization requested in the amendment that was just voted on.

The list which is on the desk of every Senator has been gone over with persons knowledgeable in the space world. We have omitted the least critical items, left in the amendment the most critical ones.

We have reduced the amount for space flight operations, which is item 2 on the list, $129 million. We have cut that amount to $66 million. We have cut all of the amount on the item for Apollo. By these two large cuts, we have cut more than $200 million and left an increase of only $116 million. Most of them were covered in detail in my initial explanation of the major amendment, which required some three-quarters of an hour. In the interest of time I shall not repeat that.

This amendment cuts out the two big items. It provides funds for space vehicle adjustments and the launching platform, and for the development of a new space suit for the astronauts, one which will be less cumbersome.

The amendment provides for many small items. One item would permit some continuing investigation and research so as to make the engines and machines we now have more viable and more economical. One item for example, is the effort, by research, to decrease the cost of launching a vehicle from $500 a pound, as it is now, to only $50 a pound. This is a stripped-down, minimum amendment of $116 million to permit NASA to go forward with research until the time when we get more active in space.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I oppose the amendment for the same reasons stated on the last one. The authorizing committee considered this bill very carefully and tried to arrive at a balanced program, one that would permit NASA to act effectively. The bill we have submitted is exactly in the same amount as the President's request. The House Appropriations Committee has already acted and has reduced the program $18.54 million below the amount which we authorized in this bill. So this would simply be an exercise in futility.

All of the committee members who have studied this matter in great detail support the present amount that is requested. I hope the Senate will vote down this amendment.

I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Maine.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, my remarks made earlier in opposition to the first amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from Texas equally apply to this amendment. Again I refer my colleagues to the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee's report on NASA's authorizations for fiscal 1970 for the reasons why the House-passed increases were rejected.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I am ready to yield back my time.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes. Let me repeat what I pointed out earlier in explanation of the amendment. We are cutting back very drastically on NASA. We are cutting back on its research. By comparison, while the NASA budget is being cut to pieces, so that it is only 62.5 percent of what it was, from $5.9 billion to $3.7 billion, the Defense Department's request was increased by over half a billion dollars, $515 million, for astronautical and space research and development programs—not the whole budget, but merely for the space and astronautical research program.

It appears that we are just phasing out NASA and utilizing in its place the Defense Department's space and astronautical research programs. Here we are phasing out the broader based research of NASA in space—which is also used for defense—and at the same time increasing by over half a billion dollars the Department of Defense requests for astronautical and space research and development programs.

This amendment requests only $116 million over the committee allowance. It would be approximately half the difference between the authorization of the House committee and the Senate committee. This is a very modest request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back my time.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, let me merely point out that the Department of Defense space budget is $2,210 million. If we continue decreasing NASA's budget, the defense space budget will be double that of the NASA budget. I submit that one is skyrocketing while the other is being pulled down to the point of disassembling research teams. I submit it is not wise to disassemble those teams. We have not had happen to one of NASA's vehicles what happened to the submarine in California. We have not had happen to NASA vehicles what happened to the helicopters that were not able to fly because their blades came off. The NASA program has been one of the miracles of industrial science. Not one vehicle that was sent up with a human being has ever fallen back. It is a miracle. Never in the history of industrial of engineering science has anything worked like NASA has worked.

Yet we have seen what has happened in the Department of Defense, where helicopters would not work, where a submarine sank, and where they have huge cost overrun. So I do not think it is wise to cut back on NASA's budget while increasing the Department of Defense budget. We have in NASA the most efficient operation in the history of science and engineering that this Government has ever created. All I am asking for is $116 million. Even if approved, it would

have to go through the Approviations Committee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, let the RECORD show I voted against the amendment offered by the able Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will so show.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask that the RECORD show that I voted "yea" on the last amendment of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On whose time?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. On my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the time of the Senator from Texas.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, are we at third reading?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not yet.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I send to the desk a further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the amendment reads as follows:

On page 17, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 6. It is the sense of the Congress that the momentum of the space program be maintained as a matter of high national priority and that timely commitment to new space programs is urgently needed. In order to carry out the provisions of this section, after consideration of the recommendations made by the President's space task group, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall submit to the Congress as soon as possible, but not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act a report outlining such new programs together with such recommendations for new legislation as the Administration deems appropriate."

On page 17, line 20, strike out "Sec. 6" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 7".

I understand, Mr. President, that this amendment would call for debate. I have had indication that there would be debate on both sides, since we are going into the question of national priorities.

In view of the lateness of the hour and the fact that some Senators have engagements elsewhere, and because there will probably be an opportunity to debate the matter on the appropriations later, and at a more propitious time, I wanted to get the sense of the amendment into the RECORD at this time and serve notice that we will take it up later.

At this time, I withdraw the amendment, and shall not ask for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator withdraws his amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the committee amendment and third reading of the bill.

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

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CANNON. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, in the bill before the Senate, which is not far from passage, we have reached the end of the beginning of our activities in space.

The achievement of the landing on the moon and the safe return of the astronauts has demonstrated to our people and to the world that we have created the necessary capability for space activities. That capability can be employed for benefits to man on earth, for the advancement of knowledge and, if necessary, to enhance the security of our country and the free world.

Regarding the Moon itself, this bill provides for a program of nine manned lunar landings following the Apollo 11 mission, extending through 1972. These flights are a logical approach to a later decision on lunar exploration for the period after 1972.

Also authorized by this bill are programs to realize further practical benefits—in particular, the earth resources program. Viewing the earth from space will help us to manage our agriculture, atmosphere, water and mineral reserves. It will speed the coming of the day when we can tap the wealth of the oceans.

The bill will also accelerate our progress toward the goal of accurate, long-range weather forecasts, and it will provide for studies of direct broadcast communications from space and of civil navigation aids. It will move ahead the application space technology to other areas of business and industry, thus continuing to stimulate the real growth of our economy, so necessary for the solution of the problems of the times.

Last winter, a distinguished group of scientists was asked to examine the future of the space program. The group included three Nobel Prize winners—Chairman Charles H. Townes, Luis Alvarez and William Shockley—and Dr. Lee A. Dubridge who participated in the deliberations up to the time of his appointment as President Nixon's science adviser.

The committee reached the conclusion that the United States should continue strong efforts to remain in the forefront of all major categories of space activity, including space sciences, solar system exploration, manned flight capability, and economic applications. It concluded that the annual investment of a half to 1 percent of the gross national product is reasonable for the civilian space program. The present measure would authorize less than one-half of 1 percent of the GNP for the civilian space program in fiscal year 1970.

Now what is the relationship of this program to our national security? A recent decision by the Department of Defense terminated the work on the manned orbiting laboratory, which would have permitted experimentation to determine the ability of men to perform tasks related to national security. The cancellation of the program was purely for reasons of economy. It was made clear that the decision did not reflect on the quality of the work or on the ultimate value of manned flight for military purposes. But it was decided that in the next few years, national security needs could be met with less costly automated missions.

The resulting situation underlines the importance of continuing the efforts in the civilian space program. The missions to the moon and the earth-orbital flights in the Apollo applications program, scheduled for 1971 and 1972, will provide a detailed understanding of man's ability to live and work in space conditions. This knowledge will permit logical decisions regarding the uses of man for national security purposes.

Because of the considerations just outlined, the funds authorized by this measure are a prudent application of a reasonable share of our national resources to meet significant needs. The funds for the space program have been declining for 5 years in absolute terms. The rate of decline is even greater when we consider the growth of our economy and the impact of inflation.

Finally, events in space have always had a significant relationship to international affairs. In earlier years, our international position suffered because of the comparison between our achievements and those of the Soviets. Success in space now provides the United States with greater flexibility. We may be approaching a time when space activities will be marked by a much greater degree of international cooperation than has been the case in the past. With the support of this bill, the Senate may well hasten the arrival of that time.

The prestige of the United States has risen to new heights because of the exploration of the Moon and the landing of men on it.

The space program will make resources of the universe available to improve man's life on earth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. CANNON. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, it had been my intention, after the offering of his amendments by the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), to offer an-

other amendment adding $66 million for the space station and space shuttle we had discussed earlier as being very important to carry on manned space flight operations in the mid-1970's.

However, I can see the handwriting on the wall, and it obviously is not the disposition of the Senate to increase the amount of this bill. Hence, I shall not offer the amendment.

However, in order to show my strong feeling as to the fact that we do need more money to carry on the manned space flight program, I should like to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point, and I ask unanimous consent that that be done, the remarks I would have made on the amendment.

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

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the amendment which I offer is to add $66 million to Space Flight Operations for use in the study, design and development of a space station and low cost space shuttle. The bill before us provides for only $9 million in preliminary study effort to examine the space station concepts and low cost recoverable space shuttle concepts. Over the past several years both NASA and industry have examined many possible opportunities for utilizing a manned space station in near earth orbit. These studies have made abundantly clear that there is much utility to be gained from developing such a space station.

Consequently, a workshop and astronomical telescope mount will be orbited in 1972 as part of the Apollo Applications Program to provide a forerunner to a true space station. It is important that the technology necessary to build a large space station in the mid 70's be exhaustively examined at an early point in time so that subsequent to the flight of the Apollo Applications Program workshop, a space station of maximum utility can be built. The station would allow for not only scientific experimentation, but also for utilitarian application of weather and navigation and earth resources surveys. Undoubtedly many other opportunities will occur once we have had the opportunity to operate for longer durations in near earth orbit.

In addition to this, the $66 million would provide the early technology development of a low cost space shuttle system. Such a vehicle would reduce the cost of sending a payload into near earth orbit from approximately $500 per pound on the Saturn V vehicle to approximately $100 per pound or less with a low cost space shuttle. Such a low cost shuttle would be capable of flying into orbit and returning without any of the components being thrown away. It would provide a true transportation system similar to our jet aircraft today in that it could be used many times. The low cost shuttle would also have the advantage of being able to return to earth just as an airplane does on a standard runway. I am advised that it is within our technological capability to build a prototype of such a shuttle system by the mid 1970's. Such a low cost vehicle used in conjunction with a space station opens new vistas for manned space flight. Its relatively low cost and reusability means it will become economical for the United States to expand its operations in space and welcome international researchers and programs for utilization of space stations and space shuttles. Because of the lower costs it will also open many new opportunities to gain the maximum return from the already substantial investment we have made in our national space effort.

My amendment of $66 million would have been divided approximately equally between the space shuttle and the space station thus assuring that the United States will remain a leader in space exploration and utilization in the mid 1970's.

The low cost space shuttle system has been under extensive scrutiny by the President's Space Task Group for the past few months. Under the leadership of Vice President Agnew, this Task Group, composed of senior representatives from NASA, DOD and the Office of Science and Technology, has examined this concept and now that the President's Task Group report has been released, the low cost shuttle system has been endorsed as being of prime importance to the future of our national space program.

Therefore, the adoption of this amendment would have assured that adequate support would be provided for our future space effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. CANNON. I yield the Senator from Montana 5 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CANNON. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday I addressed the Senate on the present posture of our space program, and raised some questions about where we are going in the future. Among other things, I suggested an amendment to the NASA authorization bill which would encourage the space agency to explore the possibilities for international cooperation in exploring space. However, as I indicated yesterday, I do not intend to call up this amendment. Nor do I intend to call up my amendment which would postpone further manned landings on the moon.

The fact that these amendments are not called up, though, does not make them any less valid. This country cannot continue to go on spending untold billions of dollars on its space program just to prove to itself that it has the technological know-how to land a man on the moon. The taxpayer is entitled to a greater—and less inflationary—return on his money.

At a time when we have a very high tax burden, and our taxpayers are as some have described it, on the verge of a revolt; when we have the most serious inflation we have had in some 20 years, a state of inflation that gives every indication of becoming worse; when interest rates are higher than at any time in our history; and when this program, as I am about to explain, contributes particularly to that situation, it seems to me most inadvisable to engage in this part of the program, namely, manned lunar landings, which have a benefit-cost ratio which can best be described as infinity in reverse.

As I think I can point out, there are no benefits in this program at all—none. Last night I challenged Senators to point to any benefits to be obtained from a second to a 10th landing on the moon within the next 3 years. I have not heard any. I wrote to NASA and asked them if they would provide me with their views as to the benefits, and I shall read briefly from the reply I received from them in a moment.

However, the Senate has just completed a long and arduous debate over S. 2546, the 1970 military authorization bill. During the course of the 2½-month debate on that bill the Senate thoroughly aired such questions as: Does military spending make it more difficult to control inflation? What kind of return are we getting for each dollar spent on military hardware? Why can we not step up our efforts for international cooperation—that is, arms talks and disarmament—and thereby reduce the need for some of the enormously expensive weapons systems? And, should not some of these programs be postponed to provide an opportunity for an independent study of their effectiveness?

Questions of a similar nature apply equally well to the space program and should be asked. But, from a practical point of view, I recognize that at the present time the Senate may be wearying of debating questions such as these. If these questions on the space program were raised now, especially only 2 or 3 days after the astronauts were here at the Capitol, and when the Senate is in its present mood, I do not think they would receive the support which I think they justify, and perhaps will receive in a few weeks when we have the appropriation bill before us, and have an opportunity to ask ourselves the same questions and make basically the same decisions.

In light of this, I have decided not to press these questions or call up my amendments during the discussion of H.R. 11271, the 1970 NASA authorization bill. However, I do intend to raise these questions when the independent offices-HUD appropriations bill for fiscal 1970, which includes appropriations for NASA, comes to the floor, probably several weeks from now. I am hopeful that at that time the Senate will give very careful scrutiny to our space program, with a view in mind to the many other legitimate needs here on earth that must necessarily be postponed in order to fund these space missions. To fail to consider these needs, and to overlook the question of priorities that is necessarily involved here, would be an abdication of our responsibility to the taxpayer who foots the bill for these programs.

Before voting on final passage of H.R. 11271, I think the Senate is entitled to a full explanation of what commitments this country is entering into for future programs beyond Project Apollo. This is a continuing problem as far as NASA's programs are concerned. In preparing amendments to this bill, for example, I gave serious consideration to reducing

the number of Apollo flights from the presently planned three a year to two a year, or to one per year. I inquired of NASA, the General Accounting Office, and the Bureau of the Budget how much could be saved in the nearly $1.7 billion figure for Apollo flights if these flights were cut by either one-third or two-thirds a year. I was astounded by the answer; virtually nothing. NASA estimated that if the flights were reduced from three a year to two a year, some $30 million or only 2 percent out of $1.691 billion could be saved. If we went from three landings a year to one landing a year, $45 million or 3 percent could be saved. In other words, if we reduce the program by two-thirds, we save less than 3 percent of the costs. The reason for this is that the Apollo hardware—booster rockets, spacecraft, lunar modules—accounts for well over half the costs, and this is an irreducible figure according to NASA. Why is it irreducible? Because somewhere along the way, Congress authorized NASA to make 15 flights to the Moon, and this apparently authorized NASA to give the go-ahead on production for 15 Saturn V's, 15 command modules, 15 service modules, 15 lunar modules, and so on.

Mr. President, in other words the Senator is now caught up in a squeeze. We want to cut back on the Apollo program, but we find that we cannot because the program is already too far along the line.

This is an argument that is typically raised when the Senate seeks to cut on an appropriations measure. But this is an authorization bill, Mr. President; if we cannot cut here, where and when do we cut?

For this reason, I think the Senate is entitled to full disclosure from both NASA and the Senate Space Committee. In particular, I think we are entitled to know just what NASA anticipates as far as a program directed toward Mars is concerned. The President's Space Task Force is now talking in terms of a Mars landing sometime in the mid-1980's. Such a program could end up costing the American taxpayer $200 billion—almost 10 times the already gigantic cost of the moon landing. The Senate is entitled to some disclosure on just what the cost would be and, more important, at what pace would we go? How much would be required annually? And, at what point would irrevocable decisions be made that would commit us to production and operations with no turning back? I think NASA has been sorely remiss in providing the Senate with answers to these questions in the past. This Senator, for one, wants to make sure that these answers are provided in the future.

Mr. President, most important of all is the question of what we would get for this gigantic expenditure of $1.7 billion on further manned moon landings. This is, in my view, the most completely unjustified expenditure of more than a billion dollars that I have ever seen.

Most important of all, Mr. President, What are the benefits to be derived from nine additional manned landings on the Moon in the next 3 years? These benefits—such as they are—are so intangible, so removed from life here on earth, that I am continually amazed that they are used as justification for such mammoth expenditures.

I would like to again commend to the Senate's attention a letter I received yesterday from NASA Administrator Paine. Dr. Paine's letter attempts—wholly inadequately, I think—to provide a justification of the benefits project Apollo will bring.

I point out that this is in response to my request of Dr. Paine in which I asked him with particular regard to future manned moon flights exactly what we expect to accomplish in the fields of communications, meteorology, earth resources, science and technology, education, and human fulfillment.

I took the various fields of accomplishment directly from the statement he made that these were the areas in which the space program would contribute to our country. I wanted to know how the manned landings on the moon would contribute.

Here is what Dr. Paine has to say about the reasons for manned space flight:

> Manned lunar exploration in the near term will contribute primarily to the fulfillment of the human goal of exploration and to advancing our scientific knowledge and understanding of the moon and thereby of the earth and the other elements of the solar system.

In other words, all the moon flight is going to do is make us feel better. Human fulfillment. It gives somewhat better knowledge of the way the earth developed, the moon developed, and the solar system developed, but knowledge which they cannot show would be of any benefit in solving any of our domestic problems in terms of health, in terms of a better life, or in terms of improving the lot of a single human being here on earth.

They added:

> In the long run, manned exploration of the moon—like other exploration into the unknown—will undoubtedly have many other significant direct benefits which are not now foreseen.

In other words, we do not know what we are going to get. I want to make it clear that I am not saying we should end our exploration forever. What I am saying is that in this period of serious inflation, when we are faced with a taxpayers' revolt, and when we have these very urgent domestic needs, we can postpone manned lunar flights, since there is no real purpose served, and NASA cannot come up with any purpose.

One final point, Mr. President. Even if we accept the value of the benefits cited by NASA, we ought to keep in mind that they fail to satisfy any genuine human need. Going to the moon does not build a house. It does not provide education for doctors, lawyers, nurses, and teachers. It does not eradicate our slums, solve our crime problem, or cure disease. And, in all probability, it will not provide raw materials or natural resources. It does seriously aggravate our inflation. It does increase the tax burden. It does divert highly skilled manpower from constructive purposes here on earth.

I submit, Mr. President, that this is the most inflationary kind of spending that we can have. Spending without satisfying an economic need, dollars expended without any corresponding increase in the supply of economic goods, is exactly what heats up the economy, and has the most inflationary impact on the goods and services we buy. If we are ever going to make inroads on inflation and soaring interest rates, we have to cut down on Federal spending that produces no economic benefits. The military and space program are the two highly inflationary areas of Government expenditure.

I know that much of that is necessary. I voted for the bill on final passage. I have voted for the space program on final passage. I think it has some meritorious provisions in it. However, it has some elements that can give us no benefits. They are certainly inflationary. That seems to me to be a serious mistake.

I explained that I am not going to offer these amendments for a vote today on this bill because of the situation. However, I will offer them later.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to ask a few questions of the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill.

Beyond the present Project Apollo, what commitments does H.R. 11271 make in the following areas:

First. The $2.5 million for advanced missions.

Would this commit us to any further mandatory expenditure on future appropriations bills?

Mr. CANNON. That is for studies only.

Mr. PROXMIRE. On my second point, would the $138.8 million for "Lunar and planetary exploration" commit us to explore other planets? If so, to what extent are we committed?

Mr. CANNON. Those are unmanned missions.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand there are to be unmanned missions. However, I wonder if there are any funding commitments under which we are obligated to provide future authorizations.

Mr. CANNON. The program is funded annually. So, there would be no commitment to ongoing or continuing appropriations.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think I can scrap the rest of these questions and put it in this manner. We are told by the space people—and I have checked this with the GAO and they say this is correct—that even if we were to stop the space program, we would not save very much money because we are committed under contracts to go ahead and build some 15 additional Saturn V's. That commitment has been made, and now we are authorizing funds in this bill to meet those past commitments and will have to authorize further funds. I will not try to reverse that. That would be crying over spilled milk. However, I want to be sure that

there is no additional commitment in the bill that would require the Senate in future years to authorize further funds because we would be obligated to do so.

Mr. CANNON. The reason for the present situation is that booster and other space hardware production was a part of the Apollo program authorized and approved by the Senate. Contracts were let for these boosters based upon the best estimates of numbers required at the time. The contracts had to be let far in advance of launch due to long loadtimes if we were going to continue the program and carry out the desired missions. All of those nine remaining boosters have either been constructed or are in the process of construction at the present.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is what I wanted to get at. We are not authorizing any similar program or similar action in this bill which would require additional authorizations.

Mr. CANNON. There is some leadtime money in here that can be used on some of the anticipated programs. However, we are not committing ourselves to a hardware program. As I stated, these programs are funded annually.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, one of the amendments that the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Alabama were arguing for was to commit us to a more extensive production of booster vehicles. We rejected that proposal today.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand that in the pending authorization bill there is $112.6 million for a launch vehicle procurement program. I wonder what sort of production commitments beyond Apollo does this make if any?

Mr. CANNON. That is for unmanned satellites.

This is the launch vehicle procurement program. This is all for launch vehicles for unmanned satellite programs.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator. I presume then that this makes no further funding commitment that would mandate additional authorizations later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CANNON. I yield myself 2 minutes.

I ask unanimous consent that, in response to the Senator from Wisconsin's question as to the objectives that are to be accomplished, we may have printed in the RECORD a portion of Dr. Miller's testimony before the committee, contained on page 99.

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

ACTIVITIES ON THE MOON

Our activities on the moon will extend man's knowledge to a new world; to acquire the insight and perspective resulting from this knowledge and, perhaps, to provide opportunities for international cooperation, as in Antarctica and in the exploration of other scientific frontiers.

Some of the more specific objectives of lunar exploration are: first to understand dynamic processes on earth through direct comparison of the earth and the moon. The physical properties of the moon and the observations of the earth from the moon can tell us much, for example, about the cause of earthquakes—bringing us that much closer to the time when they can be predicted just as we predict weather.

A second objective is to evaluate the natural resources of the 14.6 million square mile lunar surface. These resources include not only minerals of a nature yet to be determined, but also a uniquely available combination of high vacuum and a gravitation field one-sixth as strong as that of earth. On the results of our evaluation will depend our decision some years from now as to whether there is sufficient potential to justify establishing a lunar base.

We will also want to investigate the possibility of using the moon as an island near our shores to which we can voyage in these early years of the space age to develop man's potential to function as an explorer throughout the solar system.

Finally, by exploring the moon we have the opportunity to gain new understanding of the solar system and its origin and perhaps to gain clues to the origin of life. As an objective for exploration in the solar system, the moon ranks next to Mars in the judgment of the scientific world. But it has the advantage of nearness. It is reachable here and now. Thus the concentration of scientific attention on this available object can produce very substantial additions to understanding of the universe during the next few years.

The lunar exploration program is in accordance with these objectives. The initial phases of this program have been defined. The first four missions will consist of landings that sample the major classes of regions that are accessible in the equatorial region on the visible face of the moon. In a sense, we will be looking for the kind of information that we could obtain about the United States by landing first on the Great Plains, then on the eastern Coastal Plain, followed by landings at Denver and western Pennsylvania in the Appalachians. In later missions it will be possible to determine how and why certain anomalous areas differ from these regions.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, for the information of the Senate, a scientific column entitled "The Aerospace Generation Gap," which appeared in the newspaper Today, published in the Cape Kennedy area.

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

THE AEROSPACE GENERATION GAP

Aerospace firms are suffering a "multiple generation gap," which points the way for a lean year or two.

In space, the gap is between Apollo and other major projects such as the space shuttle and large orbiting space stations.

In aviation the gap exists between jet aircraft and the coming generation of supersonic transports and airbuses.

And the third gap is in military spending. The same Congress which used to agree to every demand from the Pentagon is now lined up with the shears, ready to trim each request.

What this means in local terms is evident as people get laid off at the Kennedy Space Center and the Eastern Test Range.

In spite of "For Sale" signs going up around the county, some people insist on hiding their heads in the Florida sand and refuse to see what is happening.

THE BARE FACTS

Business Week Magazine looked around the country and found:

Boeing Company employment has dropped 26,000 or 18 percent, and another 9,000 may be dropped. Orders reaching $400 million have been canceled or delayed, and costs are up on 747 aircraft production.

North American Rockwell sales dropped $100 million and 10,000 people were laid off.

United Aircraft sales will drop $100 million and employment is off.

Lockheed Aircraft has dropped a bundle on the C-5A super-sized military airplane development, and now the Defense Department is preparing to cut back its order. Lockheed has also been hurt in helicopter production.

More than 10,000 people have been laid off as a result of impact of the cancellation of the Manned Orbiting Laboratory program, with most hitting McDonnell Douglas and General Electric.

Of course the biggest impact of all this year is from the cutback in Apollo. Where once 420,000 people worked several shifts a day and lots of overtime, now only 200,000 are faced with keeping up the quality and excellence.

Money is so tight within the space agency that its own centers at Huntsville, Houston and here in Florida are cutting each other's throat for work.

Marshall Space Flight Center is engaged in an all-out battle with the Manned Spacecraft Center over spacecraft development work.

Engineers and technicians who used to feel confident of finding work somewhere in the aerospace industry have to look elsewhere, for at least the next couple of years.

All is not gloomy, however. Grumman has work on the F-14 fighter, Lockheed on Poseidon and an anti-submarine aircraft, Martin Marietta on the Sprint missile, McDonnell-Douglas on the F-4 fighter and the Spartan missile and Northrop on the F-5-21.

There was a time when companies felt confident that if civilian space spending dropped off—as it indeed has done—they could always fall back on the military programs.

In 1969 that just isn't true. Many companies are scrambling to diversify into other areas such as city management and computer software for industry.

There has been a lot of talk, most of it lip service, about applying space-age techniques to the needs of society.

A handful of firms have spent the money, done the research and learned the lessons and will now be in line to survive the coming winter of discontent in the aerospace business.

For others, it will be a long winter.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, prior to voting, I wish to express, on behalf of the committee, our very great appreciation for the leadership exhibited by our chairman, the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), and by the ranking minority member, the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH), who devoted long and careful hours of work and attention to this bill in an attempt to try to balance the equities and to try to find places where we could economize and still keep a useful and effective space program underway.

I know that in saying that I speak not only for the members of the committee but also for the entire Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CANNON. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S ADDRESS BEFORE THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, yesterday, President Nixon made a rather comprehensive speech before the United Nations in which he asked for the cooperation of other nations, and Russia in particular, in an effort to bring about an early end to the wars and the near wars which are now plaguing the world. The President was also seeking the prevention of future wars.

This afternoon, according to the news ticker, Mr. Gromyko, speaking for Russia, rejected President Nixon's request and submitted another long agenda of items for discussion looking to the establishment and maintenance of peace sometime in the future. I think we should have no objection to discussing any part of Russia's agenda which looks toward peace in the far distant future; but such discussions may go on for years, and I believe that President Nixon was thoroughly right when he asked for Russia's cooperation to establish peace in the world today, not some day in the distant future.

Until Russia is willing to discusss measures looking to an early peace, a peace which would come about very soon, I think we can very properly be skeptical of her motives when she asks for long discussions looking to the establishment of peace in the future.

The President's speech, so far as I know, has not been distributed among the Members of Congress as yet, but it was printed in the New York Times this morning; and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD, so that Members of Congress may have a chance to read it and study it over the weekend.

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

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT NIXON TO GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Madame President, Mr. Secretary General, distinguished Foreign Ministers, Prime Ministers, delegates, my fellow citizens of the world community:

I first wish to express my deep appreciation for the honor of addressing this organization for the first time and also take this opportunity to welcome all of those from 126 countries who are here at the United Nations General Assembly session. And particularly on a personal note I appreciate the opportunity to have been welcomed today by the Secretary General.

It is hard to realize as we were reminiscing just 16 years ago he welcomed me to Burma when he was chief of protocol and I was Vice President. Since then, we have both come up in the world to a certain extent.

I think we would all agree that there is no nobler destiny, nor any greater gift that one age could make to the ages that follow than to forge the key to a lasting peace.

And in this great assembly, the desirability of peace needs no affirmation. The methods of achieving it are what so greatly challenge our courage, our intelligence, our discernment.

And surely if one lesson above all rings resoundingly among the many shattered hopes in his world, it is that good words are not a substitute for hard deeds and noble rhetoric is no guarantee of noble results.

We might describe peace as a process embodied in a structure. For centuries, peace was the absence of war. Stability was the absence of change.

NO STABILITY WITHOUT CHANGE

But in today's world, there can be no stability without change—so that peace becomes a continuing process of creating evolution. It is no longer enough to restrain war. Peace must also embrace progress—both in satisfying man's material needs and in fulfilling his spiritual needs.

The test of the structure of peace is that it insure for the people of each nation the integrity of their borders, their right to develop in peace and safety and their right to determine their own destiny without outside interference.

As long as we live with the threat of aggression, we need physical restraints to contain it.

But the truest peace is based on self-restraint—on the voluntary acceptance of those basic rules of behavior that are rooted in mutual respect and demonstrated in mutual forbearance.

The more closely the world community adheres to a single standard in judging international behavior, the less likely that standard is to be violated.

I'm well aware that many nations have questions about the world role of the United States in the years ahead—about the nature and extent of our future contribution to the structure of peace.

Let me address those doubts and address them quite candidly before this organization.

In recent years, there has been mounting criticism here in the United States of the scope and the results of our international commitments.

This trend, however, has not been confined to the United States alone. In many countries we find a tendency to withdraw from responsibilities; to leave the world's often frustrating problems to the other fellow and just to hope for the best.

UNITED STATES HAS NOT TURNED AWAY

As for the United States, I can state here today without qualification: We have not turned away from the world.

We know that with power goes responsibility.

We are neither boastful of our power, nor apologetic about it. We recognize that it exists; and that as well as conferring certain advantages, it also imposes upon us certain obligations.

As the world changes, the pattern of those obligations and responsibilities changes.

At the end of World War II, the United States for the first time in history assumed the major responsibility for world peace.

We were left in 1945 as the one nation with sufficient strength to contain the new threats of aggression, and with sufficient wealth to help the injured nations back to their feet.

For much of the world, those first difficult postwar years were a time of dependency.

And the next step was toward independence, as new nations were born and old nations revived.

And now we are maturing together into a new pattern of interdependence.

It is against this background that we have been urging other nations to assume a greater share of responsibility for their own security, both individually and together with their neighbors. The great challenge now is to enlist the cooperation of many nations in preserving peace and in enriching life.

This cannot be done by American edict, or by the edict of any other nation. It must reflect the concepts and the wishes of the people of those nations themselves.

TWO FORMS OF NATIONALISM

The history of the postwar period teaches that nationalism can be dangerously disruptive—or powerfully creative.

Our aim is to encourage the creative forms of nationalism; to join as partners where our partnership is appropriate, and where it is wanted, but not to let a U.S. presence substitute for independent national effort or infringe on national dignity and national pride.

It is not my belief that the way to peace is by giving up our friends or letting down our allies. On the contrary, our aim is to place America's international commitments on a sustainable long-term basis, to encourage local and regional initiatives, to foster national independence and self-sufficiency, and by so doing to strengthen the total fabric of peace.

It would be dishonest particularly before this sophisticated audience to pretend that the United States has no national interest of its own, or no special concern for its own interests.

However, our most fundamental national interest is in maintaining that structure of international stability on which peace depends, and which makes orderly progress possible.

Since I took office as President, no single question has occupied so much of my time and energy as the search for an end to the war in Vietnam, an end fair to the people of South Vietnam, fair to the people of North Vietnam and fair to those others who would be affected by the outcome.

We in the United States want to end this war, and we are ready to take every reasonable step to achieve that goal. But let there be no question on this one fundamental point: in good conscience we cannot, in the long term interest of peace, we will not accept a settlement that would arbitrarily dictate the political future of South Vietnam and deny to the people of South Vietnam the basic right to determine their own future free of any outside interference.

As I put it in my address to the American people last May "What the United States wants for South Vietnam is not the important thing. What North Vietnam wants for South Vietnam is not the important thing. What is important is what the people of South Vietnam want for South Vietnam."

FUNDAMENTAL OBJECTIVE STATED

To secure this right, and to secure this principle, is our one limited but fundamental objective.

Both in public and in the Paris talks we have offered a number of proposals which would bring peace and provide self determination. And we're ready to consider any other proposals that have the same objective. The missing ingredient so far has been the willingness of the other side to talk on any terms other than those that would predetermine the result and deny the right of self-determination to the people of South Vietnam. Once that willingness exists and once there is a genuine willingness by the other side to reach agreement, the practical solution can readily be found.

This makes it urgent that the U.N. members, those in this room who have long taken an active interest in peace in Vietnam, now take an active hand in achieving it. Many urge that if only we halted our bombing of the North, peace would follow. Nearly a year has passed since the bombing of the North was halted.

Three months have passed since we began the process of troop replacement, signaling both our own genuine desire for a settlement and the increased readiness of the South Vietnam to manage their own defense.

As I announced on Tuesday, by Dec. 15 our troop strength in Vietnam will have been reduced by a minimum of 60,000 men.

On Sept. 2, 1969, North Vietnam's chief negotiator in Paris said that if the United States committed itself to the principle of totally withdrawing its forces from South Vietnam and if it withdrew a significant

number of troops, Hanoi would take this into account.

TIME FOR RESPONSE HAS COME

I repeat here today what I said in my speech of May 14—that we are prepared to withdraw all of our forces from South Vietnam and the replacement of 60,000 is a significant step.

The time has come for the other side to respond to these initiatives.

The time has come for peace.

And in the name of peace, I urge all of you here—representing 126 nations—to use your best diplomatic efforts to persuade Hanoi to move seriously into the negotiations which could end this war. The steps we have taken have been responsive to views expressed in this room, and we hope that views from this organization may also be influential in Hanoi. If these efforts are successful, this war can end.

The people of Vietnam, North and South alike, have demonstrated heroism enough to last a century. And I speak from personal observation. I have been to North Vietnam, to Hanoi in 1953, and all over South Vietnam. I have seen the people of the North and the people of the South. The people of Vietnam, North and South, have endured an unspeakable weight of suffering for a generation and they deserve a better future.

When the war ends the United States will stand ready to help the people of Vietnam, all of them, in their tasks of renewal and reconstruction. And when peace comes at last to Vietnam, it can truly come with healing in its wings.

In relations between the United States and the various Communist powers, I have said that we move from an era of confrontation to an era of negotiation.

I believe our relations with the Soviet Union can be conducted in a spirit of mutual respect, recognizing our differences and also our right to differ; recognizing our divergent interests, and also our common interests; recognizing the interests of our respective allies as well as our own.

MAJOR PROBLEMS STILL EXIST

Now it would be idle to pretend that there are no major problems between us, and conflicting interests. The tensions of the past 30 years have not been caused by mere personal misunderstanding. This is why we have indicated the need for extended negotiations on a broad front of issues.

Already, as you know, we have had extensive consultation with the Soviet Union as well as with others about the Middle East, where events of the past few days point up anew the urgency of a stable peace.

The United States continues to believe that the U.N. cease-fire resolutions define the minimal conditions that must prevail on the ground if settlement is to be achieved in the Middle East. We believe the Security Council resolution of November, 1967, charts the way to that settlement.

A peace, to be lasting, must leave no seeds of a future war. It must rest on a settlement which both sides have a vested interest in maintaining.

We seek a settlement based on respect for the sovereign right of each nation in the area to exist within secure and recognized boundaries. We are convinced that peace cannot be achieved on the basis of substantial alterations in the map of the Middle East. And we are equally convinced that peace cannot be achieved on the basis of anything less than a binding, irrevocable commitment by the parties to live together in peace.

Failing a settlement, an agreement on the limitation of the shipment of arms to the Middle East might help to stabilize the situation. We have indicated to the Soviet Union, without result, our willingness to enter such discussions.

ARMS TALKS SOUGHT

In addition to our talks on the Middle East we hope soon to begin talks with the Soviet Union on the limitation of strategic arms. There is no more important task before us.

The date we proposed for the opening of talks has passed for lack of response. We remain ready to enter negotiations.

Since the United States first proposed strategic talks three years ago the task of devising an effective agreement has become more difficult. The Soviet Union has been vigorously expanding its strategic forces; weapons systems themselves have become more sophisticated, more destructive. But as the difficulty of the talks increases, so, too, does their importance.

Though the issues are complex we are prepared to deal with them seriously, concretely and purposefully—and to make a determined effort not only to limit the build-up of strategic arms, but to reverse it.

And meanwhile, I want to affirm our support for arms-control proposals which we hope the Geneva Conference will place before this Assembly with regard to the seabed and the chemical and bacteriological warfare. We hope also that the nuclear nonproliferation treaty will soon enter into force.

WARNS AGAINST ILLUSION

We should be under no illusion, however, that arms control will itself bring peace. Wars are fought by soldiers, but they are declared by politicians. Peace also requires progress on these stubbornly persistent political questions—questions that are considered in this room—questions that still divide the world. And it requires other exchanges not only of words but of deeds, that can gradually weave a fabric of mutual trust among the nations and the peoples of the world.

We intend to conduct our negotiations with the Soviet Union soberly and seriously, neither encumbered by prejudice nor blinded by sentimentality, seeking to reach agreements rather than to make propaganda.

Whenever the leaders of Communist China choose to abandon their self-imposed isolation, we are ready to talk with them in the same frank and serious spirit.

For nearly a quarter of a century the U.N. has struggled with the often thankless task of peace-keeping.

As we look to the future, however, keeping the peace is only part of our task. We also must concentrate on building.

Let us be candid. There are many differences among the great powers, and among other powers, which as realists we know cannot be resolved quickly, cannot be resolved even by this organization. But we also know that there are at least five areas in particular of great concern to everyone here with regard to which there should be no national differences, in which our interests are common and on which there should be unanimity. They are these:

Encouraging international voluntary services.

Fostering economic development and population control.

Protecting our threatened environment.

Exploring the frontiers of space.

By any standards, aircraft hijackings are morally, politically, and legally indefensible. The Tokyo Convention has now been brought into force, providing for prompt release of passengers, crew and aircraft. Along with other nations, we also are working on a new convention for the punishment of hijackers. But neither of these conventions can be fairly effective without cooperation; sky piracy cannot be ended as long as the pirates receive asylum.

And consequently I urge the United Nations to give high priority to this matter. This is an issue that transcends politics; there is no need for it to become the subject of polemics or a focus of political differences. It involves the interests of every nation, the safety of every air passenger, and the integrity of that structure of order on which a world community depends.

The creative, dynamic kind of peace I have spoken of, of course, requires more than such basic protections as the one I have just described. To build this kind of peace we must join together in building our society in raising a great cathedral of the spirit, which celebrates the infinite possibilities of man himself.

Such a peace requires a fuller enlistment not only of government resources, and of private enterprise resources, but also of the dedication and skill of those thousands of people all over the world who are ready to volunteer in the cause of human achievement. Our own Peace Corps has helped in many countries. And I especially welcome the consideration of the U.N. itself, which is now giving to establishment of an international volunteer corps. We stand ready to give this exciting new venture our full and enthusiastic cooperation.

As the U.N. looks toward the beginning of its second development decade, it faces a time of enormous challenge but enormous opportunity.

We can only guess at the new scientific discoveries that the seventies may bring, but we can see with chilling clarity the gap that already exists between the developed economies and the economies of the developing countries and the urgent need for international cooperation in spurring economic development.

If, in the course of that second development decade, we can make both significant gains in food production and significant reduction in the rate of population growth, we shall have opened the way to a new era of splendid prosperity. If we do only one without the other we shall be standing still.

And, if we fail in both, great areas of the world will face human disaster.

PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT

Increasingly, the task of protecting man's environment is a matter of international concern. Pollution of air and water, upsetting the balance of nature—these are not only local problems and not only national problems, but matters that affect the basic relationships of man to his planet.

The United Nations already is planning a conference on the environment in 1972, and I pledge the strongest support of the United States for that effort. I hope that even before then we can launch new national and international initiatives toward restoring the balance of nature and maintaining our world as a healthy and hospitable place for man.

Of all of man's great enterprises, none lends itself more logically or more compellingly to international cooperation than the venture into space. Here, truly, mankind is one: as fellow creatures from the planet earth exploring the heavens that all of us enjoy.

The journey of Apollo 11 to the moon and back was not an end but the beginning. There will be new journeys of discovery. And beyond this, we are just beginning to comprehend the benefits that space technology can yield here on earth, and the potential is enormous.

For example, we now are developing earth resource survey satellites, with the first experimental satellite to be launched sometime early in the decade of the seventies.

Present indications are that these satellites should be capable of yielding data which could assist in as widely varied tasks as these: the location of schools of fish in the oceans; the location of mineral deposits on land; the health of agricultural crops.

I feel it is only right that we should share both the adventures and the benefits of space, and as an example of our plans, we have determined to take actions with regard

to earth resource satellites as this program proceeds and fulfills its promise.

INFORMATION SOUGHT FOR WORLD

The purpose of those actions is that this program will be dedicated to produce information not only for the United States but also for the world community. We shall be putting several proposals in this respect before the United Nations.

These are among the positive concrete steps we intend to take toward internationalizing man's epic venture into space—an adventure that belongs not to one nation but all mankind and one that should be marked not by rivalry but by the same spirit of fraternal cooperation that so long has been the hallmark of the international community of science.

And now, Madam President and Mr. Secretary General, if I could speak a personal word to the representatives gathered in this room.

I recognize that those here are dedicating their lives to the cause of peace, and that in this room what is done here will have an enormous effect on the future of peace.

I have had the great privilege over the past 23 years to travel to most of the countries represented in this room. I have met most of the leaders of the nations represented in this room, and I have seen literally thousands of people in most of the countries represented in this room.

There are differences between the nations and differences between the leaders and differences between the peoples in this world. But, based on my own experience, of this one thing I am sure: the people of the world, wherever they are, want peace, and those of us who have the responsibilities for leadership in the world have an overwhelming world mandate from the people of the nations we represent to bring peace, to keep the peace and to build the peace.

Now I realize that a survey of history might discourage those who seek to establish peace, but we have entered a new age—different not only in degree but in kind from any that has ever gone before.

A SINGLE WORLD COMMUNITY

For the first time ever, we have seen the staggering fury of the power of the universe unleashed and we know that we hold that power in a very precarious balance.

For the first time ever technological advance has brought within reach what once was only a poignant dream, for hundreds of millions—freedom from hunger, freedom from want, want and hunger that I have personally seen in nation after nation all over the world.

For the first time ever, we have seen changes in a single lifetime—in our lifetime—that dwarf the achievements of centuries before—and those changes continue to accelerate.

For the first time ever, man has stepped beyond his planet—and revealed us to ourselves as "riders on the earth together, bound inseparably on this one bright, beautiful speck in the heavens, so tiny in the universe and so incomparably welcoming as a home for man.

In this new age of firsts, even the goal of a just and lasting peace is a first we can dare to strive. We must achieve it. And I believe we can achieve it.

In that spirit, then, let us press toward an open world—a world of open doors, open hearts, open minds—a world open to the exchange of ideas and of people, and open to the reach of the human spirit—the world open in the search for truth and unconcerned with the fate of old dogmas and old isms—a world open at last to the light of justice, and the light of reason, and to the achievement of that true peace which the people of every land carry in their hearts and celebrate in their hopes.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS TO THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, 1970

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11271) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield back the remainder of our time

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 11271) was passed.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed

Mr. HOLLAND. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and Mr. CURTIS conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be permitted to make any necessary technical and clerical changes in H.R. 11271, as amended and passed by the Senate, and that it be printed.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, once again the distinguished Senior Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the able chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, has displayed his unexcelled legislative skill and ability. I refer, of course, to his magnificent handling of the NASA authorization just adopted by the Senate.

It hardly needs saying that this Nation's space achievements have been marvelous. That CLINT ANDERSON's great support of these endeavors has led to such outstanding success cannot be praised enough. The Senate again is deeply in his debt.

Our thanks is also due the distinguished Senior Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH). As the ranking minority member of committee, she again joined to assure the thorough and efficient consideration of this authorization measure. Its prompt acceptance by the Senate was due in large part to her splendid cooperation and support.

Notable also was the outstanding cooperation of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE). May I say at this time that Senator PROXMIRE's contribution to the discussion of this measure exhibited the same keen insight and diligent effort that he brings to every discussion. The same may be said for the distinguished senior Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH). Indeed, no Member of this body has a deeper interest in, nor is more cognizant of the many facets of our space effort, and we are grateful.

Finally, the great support of the distinguished Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) must be mentioned. His magnificent assistance in presenting this measure to the Senate was indispensable to its overwhelming adoption. And to the Senate as a whole, may I say that the efficient disposition of this measure today speaks well for the outstanding cooperation exhibited by all, with full regard for the views of every Member.

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the approval of my colleagues—and if there is any objection I will of course honor it—I would like to call up at this time Calendar No. 316, H.R. 11249.

Before the Chair acts, may I say that the reason for my statement is that I did not notify the Senate yesterday that we would take this measure up. I did so this morning, when I was questioned by the acting minority leader, the Senator from South Dakota, and that is the reason for the explanation. But if anyone wishes to enter an objection because of the shortness of notice only, I would be glad to reconsider, although I would prefer to bring it up if I could.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, is it the Kennedy Center measure?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the Senate debated at great length the matter of the overruns on the C-5A.

There is a comparable overrun percentage on the Kennedy Center and I think there should be comparable Senate debate and inquiry on it.

Consequently, I must take the position that this matter be brought up for full debate.

I shall not object, Mr. President, but I do hope the majority leader will reconsider and not call this bill up today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will not press it, Mr. President.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1970

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 416, H.R. 12781. I do this so that the bill will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOLE in the chair). The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 12781) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there

objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE PRESIDENT'S APPEAL FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, yesterday the President appeared before the United Nations and made an earnest, inspiring appeal for diplomatic assistance in bringing about peace in Vietnam:

The President said:

> The time has come for the other side to respond . . . The time has come for peace.

All of us who are appalled by this tragic war can only hope and pray that the President's appeal will be heeded—that in some way world opinion, through diplomatic channels and otherwise, will be marshalled in the cause of peace.

But I wonder what response we can expect from the other member nations of the world if the President's sincere effort to bring the war to an end does not receive the support here at home that it deserves?

Will we deserve support from abroad if those in positions of leadership and influence at home undertake to discount and discredit every move of our President toward peace?

It was very disturbing to read in the newspapers this morning that soon after the President of the United States appeared before the United Nations, a Member of the leadership of this body assailed the President's policy in Vietnam as "the road to war, and war, and more war."

Ignoring the fact that the unfortunate war in Vietnam has been going on a long time, and that two previous administrations were unable to resolve it, this critic went on to say, according to the New York Times:

> For three-quarters of this year, the American people have waited hopefully for new policies designed to end this costly war. Now the answer to those expectations is becoming painfully clear. The war will continue. . . .
>
> We can expect more divisions, even violence between our people as the war works its corrupting influence on every aspect of American life. . . .
>
> When measured against what must be done for peace, we have made only token troop withdrawals on the battlefield, more an exercise in politics and improvisation, while the level of fighting and casualties continue.

Mr. President, it is not difficult to suggest, as this critic has done, that the parties ought to reach a "sensible compromise" for ending the war.

But it takes more than one side to reach a compromise—and the Communists have shown no desire or inclination to do so.

Time after time, during this and the previous administration, Hanoi has ignored offers from this country and the South Vietnamese Government to negotiate a settlement of the war.

As the President indicated in a statement last Tuesday, his administration has not only made a major effort to end the war, but it has proposed eight points which certainly provide the basis for a "sensible compromise." We have: Renounced an imposed military settlement; proposed free elections organized by joint commissions under international supervision; offered the withdrawal of U.S. and allied forces over a 12-month period; declared that we would retain no military bases in Vietnam; offered to negotiate supervised cease-fires under international supervision to facilitate the process of mutual withdrawal; made clear that we would settle for the de facto removal of North Vietnamese forces so long as there are guarantees against their return; announced that we are prepared to accept any political outcome which is arrived at through free elections; and said we are prepared to discuss the 10-point program of the other side together with plans put forward by other parties.

Mr. President, do all these things, taken together, represent a "road to war, and war, and more war"?

What has been Hanoi's response? It has been obvious, so far, that the Communists want—not a compromise—but a military victory. Certainly, the proposals we have made must be regarded as a long step in the direction of a "sensible compromise."

The President has made it clear, and I think rightly so, that only one point is not negotiable: the right of the people of South Vietnam to determine their own future free of outside influence.

Mr. President, I wonder if the cause of peace at home is served when those in responsible positions speak of "more division, even violence" among our own people. Does this not encourage the very thing we deplore?

And I wonder if the cause of peace in Vietnam is served when the troop withdrawals which the President has ordered in hopes of opening the way for peace are referred to as "token withdrawals and as an exercise in politics and improvisations."

What will be the description of the reductions in drafts which have been announced today? If troop withdrawals have made it possible to reduce the draft calls significantly, that is not "tokenism."

Mr. President, a distinguished predecessor of mine in the service of this body was the late Arthur Vandenberg of Michigan.

He was a symbol of non-partisanship whenever our Nation's vital interests were concerned. He believed deeply that politics shoulld stop at the water's edge when our Nation was at war.

Though he has been gone a long time, the Senate for the most part has honored that basic principle for which he stood. I hope we shall continue to do so in the future.

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

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Michigan. It occurs to me that if we are concerned about American involvement in Vietnam and ending the war, we should unite behind the President.

I join Senator GRIFFIN in emphasizing the singular fact that we now have a President not committed to further escalation of the war, but to contracting it.

It does not serve our Nation's interest to criticize without studying the facts and without reviewing the record of the past two administrations. The instant critics of every effort of the President to end the war do nothing but divide Americans.

As the Senator pointed out, the President made it clear on May 14 and again yesterday at the United Nations that there is only one point that is not negotiable and that is the right of the South Vietnamese to self-determination.

As Senator GRIFFIN has said so well, it is time for all Americans to unite behind the President. Why are the critics not asking Hanoi, "What will your response be to this promise to withdraw 60,000 troops?" In response to those who say President Nixon's troop withdrawal is only tokenism let me say the troop reductions will amount to between 10 and 15 percent of the total U.S. strength in Vietnam.

Mr. President, I share the Senator's views.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOK in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11582) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies; and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 to the bill and concurred therein, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS, THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, AND CERTAIN INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1970—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11582) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The bill clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of September 18, 1969, p. 26010, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to make a relatively brief statement on the conference on H.R. 11582, the Post Office and Treasury Department, and Executive Office appropriations bill for fiscal year 1970.

The conference report contains a total new budget—obligational—authority in the amount of $2,276,232,000. This amount is $38,482,000 under the 1970 budget estimates; $3,900,000 over the House bill; $3,963,000 under the Senate; and $195,226,416 over 1969 appropriations made to date, including supplementals.

I wish to point out that the grand totals of titles I, III, and IV, new budget—obligational—authority, and title II, authorizations out of the postal fund, amount to $8,783,245,000. This latter amount is an increase of $414,654,416 over 1969; $38,482,000 under the 1970 estimates; $3,900,000 over the House; and $3,963,000 under the Senate bill.

TITLE I. TREASURY DEPARTMENT

For the Treasury Department, the conference bill contains new budget—obligational—authority of $1,076,740,000, an increase of $1,400,000 over the House bill; $8,169,000 under the 1970 estimate, $559,000 under the Senate recommendation; and $54,815,000 over 1969 appropriations made to date, including supplementals.

The only major change in title I occurred in connection with the Bureau of Customs. The House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agreed to the same with an amendment thus allowing $107,551,000 for salaries and expenses. Bureau of Customs, for fiscal year 1970. This amount is an increase of $1,400,000 over the House allowance and $559,000 under the Senate allowance.

The action permits the Bureau of Customs to recruit 131 additional employees over the 369 allowed under the House bill, for a total of 500 new positions. These positions are urgently needed in connection with the processing of persons arriving in the United States. The additional manpower allowed will alleviate the very serious passenger-processing delays at major international airports. In addition, 40 of the additional positions allowed under the conference action, will be assigned to the Mexican border area to strengthen enforcement efforts, especially with respect to the smuggling of marihuana, heroin, and other narcotics and dangerous drugs. There is probably no single enforcement problem more serious than that of controlling the flow of these narcotics and dangerous drugs into the United States.

The House receded on Senate amendment No. 2. Hereafter, upon approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, agents on protective missions of persons, as provided by law, that is, 18 U.S.C. 3056, as amended, may be reimbursed for subsistence expenses without regard to rates provided by 5 U.S.C. 5702.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Senate receded on its amendment No. 3, thus providing a total of $133,069,000 for administration and regional operation of the postal establishment in lieu of $132,069,000 as approved by the Senate. This amount is $14,069,000 over 1969; $3,000,000 under the estimate; $1,000,000 over the Senate bill, and the same as the House allowance. This amount will fund 790 new positions over those authorized in 1969.

The Senate receded on its amendment No. 4, which would have limited the number of employees in the Office of the Special Assistant to the Postmaster General for Congressional Affairs to 20 positions and $220,000. These limitations are now removed.

The House receded, with an amendment, on Senate amendment No. 5. This action provides the Bureau of Research, Development, and Engineering a total of $48,838,000, an increase of $2.5 million over the House allowance, for fiscal year 1970. The amount allowed under the conference report is $13,338,000 over 1969, and $2.5 million under the estimates and Senate allowance of $51,338,000. This will permit the Department to resume or continue action in areas which would otherwise be subject to fiscal constraints.

Under "Operations" the Senate receded from its amendment No. 6. Thus, $6,141,711,000 is appropriated for expenses necessary for postal operations in lieu of $6,143,615,000 as had been proposed by the Senate. I wish to point out that the amount agreed to is $164,640,000 over the 1969 appropriation and approximately double the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1960 for this item. The amount appropriated is the same as the budget request.

Senate amendment No. 7 was reported in technical disagreement. The House receded and concurred in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

Provided further, That of the amount appropriated by this act for postal operations, $5,500,000 shall be for additional window service at large post offices and for maintaining present levels of special delivery and multiple-trip business delivery service at locations where the Postmaster General shall determine such maintenance of service to be necessary or desirable.

The Senate bill had earmarked $9,218,000 for these various postal services but the best we could do in conference was to compromise on $5,500,000 for these services so vitally needed by the postal patrons. With the funds provided there can be no excuse for a deterioration of postal service. It is expected that window service, special delivery service, and multiple-trip business deliveries will be maintained at last year's level.

Mr. President, this presentation touches on the main items of the report. I wish to thank Senator BOGGS, of Delaware, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, for the invaluable assistance given me in bringing this conference report to the Senate floor. I am happy to announce that this bill, H.R. 11582, is the first regular 1970 appropriation bill on which action has been completed to date.

Mr. President, I move adoption of the conference report.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7. First I should explain that this is the one that was voted on the floor of the Senate to continue afternoon (multiple-trip business deliveries, continue expeditious delivery of special delivery letters, and achieve a 2.6-percent increase in window service. What we did was to compromise on the amount of money involved to restore window service, and to keep business deliveries and special deliveries at last year's level.

The Senate bill had earmarked $9,218,000 for these three postal services. In conference we compromised on $5,500,000 and thought that that would be adequate to carry out the programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The BILL CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

Provided further, That of the amount appropriated by this Act for Postal Operations, $5,500,000 shall be for additional window service at large post offices and for maintaining present levels of special delivery and multiple-trip business delivery service at locations where the Postmaster General shall determine such maintenance of service to be necessary or desirable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the 1969 appropriations, the 1970 budget estimates, the House and Senate action, and the conference action on the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TITLE I—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF 1969 APPROPRIATIONS, 1970 ESTIMATES, HOUSE AND SENATE ALLOWANCES AND CONFERENCE ACTION

Appropriation title	1969 appropriation [1] (includes supplemental)	1970 estimate (revised)	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with— 1969 appropriation	1970 estimate	House bill	Senate bill
Office of the Secretary	$7,925,000	$8,680,000	$8,600,000	$8,600,000	$8,600,000	+$675,000	−$80,000		
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center:									
Salaries and expenses		58,000	58,000	58,000	58,000	+58,000			
Construction		1,200,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+$1,000,000	−200,000		
Total, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center		1,258,000	1,058,000	1,058,000	1,058,000	+1,058,000	−200,000		
Bureau of Accounts	44,877,000	45,675,000	45,675,000	45,675,000	45,675,000	+798,000			
Government losses in shipment	400,000					−400,000			
Eisenhower College grants	5,000,000					−5,000,000			
Bureau of Customs	100,337,000	108,110,000	106,151,000	108,110,000	107,551,000	+7,214,000	−559,000	+1,400,000	−$559,000
Bureau of Engraving and Printing (air conditioning of buildings)	400,000					−400,000			
Bureau of the Mint	14,700,000	17,630,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	+2,300,000	−630,000		
Construction of mint facilities		1,770,000	1,770,000	1,770,000	1,770,000	+1,770,000			
Bureau of the Public Debt	58,878,000	60,370,000	60,370,000	60,370,000	60,370,000	+1,492,000			
Internal Revenue Service:									
Salaries and expenses	22,055,000	23,080,000	23,080,000	23,080,000	23,080,000	+1,025,000			
Revenue accounting and processing	191,500,000	201,171,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	+8,500,000	−1,171,000		
Compliance	545,300,000	581,715,000	576,715,000	576,715,000	576,715,000	+31,415,000	−5,000,000		
Total, Internal Revenue Service	758,855,000	805,966,000	799,795,000	799,795,000	799,795,000	+40,940,000	−6,171,000		
Office of the Treasurer	7,045,000	7,250,000	7,250,000	7,250,000	7,250,000	+205,000			
Check forgery insurance fund		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	+100,000			
U.S. Secret Service	22,708,000	27,400,000	26,871,000	26,871,000	26,871,000	+4,163,000	−529,000		
Construction of Secret Service training facilities	800,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	−100,000			
Total, title I, Treasury Department new budget (obligational) authority	1,021,925,000	1,084,909,000	1,075,340,000	1,077,299,000	1,076,740,000	+54,815,000	−8,169,000	+1,400,000	−559,000

TITLE II—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Administration and regional operation	$119,000,000	$136,069,000	$133,069,000	$132,069,000	$133,069,000	+$14,069,000	−3,000,000		+$1,000,000
Research, development, and engineering	35,500,000	51,338,000	46,338,000	51,338,000	48,838,000	+13,338,000	−2,500,000	+$2,500,000	−2,500,000
Operations	5,977,071,000	6,141,711,000	6,141,711,000	6,143,615,000	6,141,711,000	+164,640,000			−1,904,000
Transportation	622,000,000	638,900,000	630,000,000	630,000,000	630,000,000	+8,000,000	−8,900,000		
Building occupancy	210,000,000	235,323,000	230,000,000	230,000,000	230,000,000	+20,000,000	−5,232,000		
Supplies and services	110,000,000	114,917,000	114,917,000	114,917,000	114,917,000	+4,917,000			
Plant and equipment	200,000,000	215,761,000	210,000,000	210,000,000	210,000,000	+10,000,000	−5,761,000		
Postal public buildings	50,000,000	174,223,000	170,000,000	170,000,000	170,000,000	+120,000,000	−4,223,000		
Total, authorizations out of postal funds	7,323,571,000	7,708,242,000	7,676,035,000	7,681,939,000	7,678,535,000	+354,964,000	−29,707,000	+2,500,000	−3,404,000
Less net revenues (estimated)	−6,287,585,000	[2] −6,507,013,000	−6,507,013,000	−6,507,013,000	−6,507,013,000	−219,428,000			
Total, title II, Post Office Department, new budget (obligational) authority (indefinite) [3]	[3] 1,035,986,000	[3] 1,201,229,000	[3] 1,169,022,000	[3] 1,174,926,000	1,171,522,000	+135,536,000	−29,707,000	+2,500,000	−3,404,000

TITLE III—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Appropriation title	1969 appropriation [1]	1970 estimate (revised)	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with— 1969 appropriation	1970 estimate	House bill	Senate bill
Compensation of the President	$194,584	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000	+$55,416			
The White House Office	3,229,000	3,630,000	3,630,000	3,630,000	3,630,000	+401,000			
Special projects	1,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	+1,000,000			
Operating expenses, Executive Mansion	823,000	918,000	918,000	918,000	918,000	+95,000			
Bureau of the Budget	10,050,000	12,084,000	11,650,000	11,650,000	11,650,000	+1,600,000	−$434,000		
Council of Economic Advisers	1,130,000	1,182,000	1,137,000	1,137,000	1,137,000	+7,000	−45,000		
National Security Council	811,000	1,860,000	1,860,000	1,860,000	1,860,000	+1,049,000			
Emergency fund for the President	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,0000,00	1,000,000				
Expenses of management improvement	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000				
Total, title III, Executive Office of the President, new budget (obligational) authority	19,087,584	23,774,000	23,295,000	23,295,000	23,295,000	+4,207,416	−479,000		

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Administrative Conference of the United States	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	551,000	575,000	575,000	575,000	575,000	+$24,000			
Commission on Obscenity and Pornography	643,000	1,227,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	+457,000	−$127,000		
Tax Court of the United States	2,563,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	+187,000			
Total, title IV, independent agencies, new budget (obligational) authority	4,007,000	4,802,000	4,675,000	4,675,000	4,675,000	+668,000	−127,000		
Grand total, titles I, II, III, and IV, new budget (obligational) authority	$2,081,005,584	$2,314,714,000	$2,272,332,000	$2,280,195,000	$2,276,232,000	+$195,226,416	−$38,482,000	+$3,900,000	−$3,963,000
Consisting of—									
Appropriations (definite)	1,045,019,584	1,113,485,000	1,103,310,000	1,105,269,000	1,104,710,000	+59,690,416	−8,775,000	+1,400,000	−559,000
Appropriations (indefinite)	1,035,986,000	1,201,229,000	1,169,022,000	1,174,926,000	1,171,522,000	+135,536,000	−29,707,000	+2,500,000	−3,404,000
Memoranda:									
Grand total, titles I, III, and IV, new budget (obligational) authority and title II, authorizations out of the postal fund	8,368,590,584	8,821,727,000	8,779,345,000	8,787,208,000	8,783,245,000	+414,654,416	−38,482,000	+3,900,000	−3,963,000

[1] Includes amounts in 2d supplemental, 1969.
[2] Excludes $591,400,000 proposed legislative rate increase.
[3] Indefinite, because it represents the difference between specific appropriations on use of the postal fund and estimated postal revenues.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Senate has just completed action on the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill for fiscal year 1970, that being the first general appropriation bill of the Congress upon which action has been completed this year. I want to thank the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BOGGS). Without his cooperation, we would not have been through with it today. We worked together, and due to the cooperation of Senator BOGGS, the ranking minority member of the committee, we were able to complete action on that bill.

AMENDMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION ACT—APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 13194.

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. 13194) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize Federal market adjustment payments to lenders with respect to insured student loans when necessary in the light of economic conditions, in order to assure that students will have reasonable access to such loans for financing their education, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment and agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. PELL, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. SCHWEIKER conferees on the part of the Senate.

IMPORTANCE OF SENATORS BEING PRESENT FOR VOTES ON FORTHCOMING LEGISLATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there are a number of appointments at the desk of the Presiding Officer, which I hope will be acted on shortly.

The Senate has now completed action on the military procurement authorization bill and the NASA authorization bill. Attention must now be turned to a number of major legislative items, including nearly all the fiscal 1970 appropriation bills, for which passage in the remaining weeks of this session is a must. We also have a tax bill which I confidently expect will be reported to the Senate in one package not later than October 31. We have a foreign aid bill. We have a housing bill. We have an education bill. We have a pretty good schedule and a pretty big backlog to tackle in the remaining weeks and months of the first session of this Congress.

If we are to be successful in carrying out this legislative schedule, it is imperative that Senators stay in town and attend to the business of the Senate. I am happy to say, Mr. President, that that has been the norm during the course of this session, and I have been more than pleased at the number of Senators who are in the city and on the floor at all times ready to cope with legislation which may come before this body.

There are legitimate requirements, of course, which may cause Senators to be absent. Two examples are the Interparliamentary Union and North Atlantic Assembly coming up in New Delhi and Brussels, October 20 to November 7, and October 16 to 21, respectively. These are important conferences, and under normal circumstances would occasion no cautionary comments from the leadership. However, circumstances at this late date in the session are not routine, and participants in these and other conferences should be aware that votes are likely to occur with increasing frequency, and if they do, such votes have, in the eyes of the Senate, a priority over any other matter. Senators are on notice, therefore, that they are subject to recall by the leadership should important votes occur.

In other words, Mr. President, we have a great deal to do, and it is the intention of the leadership to see that we have the troops here to do it.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Senate Finance Committee, by a vote of 9 to 8, yesterday, decided to take up for consideration the question of whether the investment tax credit should be repealed.

The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON) and I voted with seven Republican members of the committee to make the majority of nine. Eight Democrats voted in the negative.

I do not regard taxes as being a partisan issue.

The business community and the farmers urgently need to know where they stand on this multi-billion-dollar tax bill. Until they know, they cannot determine the extent of their investments in new machinery, machinery which in turn creates new jobs for the people.

I think the matter should be settled without delay. I so voted as a member of the Committee on Finance.

I feel that the Committee on Finance has a responsibility, which it has now exercised, to bring this matter to the floor of the Senate.

Whether the Senate desires to act on it or to hold it until action on the highly complex and complicated tax reform measure is completed is a question for the Senate to decide. The Finance Committee has discharged its responsibility.

The Senate Finance Committee has been meeting daily and expects to hear 400 witnesses. The tax bill under consideration touches the life and livelihood of every American. Churches, schools, and colleges will feel its impact, as will State and local governments. The complexity of the issues involved in revising the Nation's tax code is enormous.

The purpose is an excellent one—to achieve tax justice. This is an important objective.

In seeking this objective, the Congress has an obligation to understand the proposals and to be sure that we do not unjustly penalize the many in order to strike at the few.

For example, representatives of the independent colleges throughout the United States, of which there are about 1,500, have testified that the legislation in its present form will penalize charitable contributions and will seriously cripple such schools. If true, this would increase the burden on tax-supported colleges.

Hospital and church officials say their institutions will likewise be crippled.

Representatives of States, counties, and cities say the cost of local government will be increased if the Congress changes the status of State and local bonds.

So I say this bill must be handled carefully and thoughtfully. It was rushed through the House, but it should not be rushed through the Senate. We should understand what we are doing.

Tax legislation should not become involved in partisan politics.

I shall, wherever possible, cooperate fully with the leadership of the Senate, but I am convinced that delaying consideration of the repeal of the investment tax credit is not in the best interests of our Nation.

If it is going to be repealed, it should be done now so that the business community will know how to plan in order to provide for the additional machinery necessary to supply additional jobs to the young people graduating from our schools and colleges. To delay action will keep this entire matter confused and up in the air.

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

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Virginia in expressing the hope that the leadership will call up this bill, which was reported today by the Committee on Finance with but one dissenting vote, so that the Senate may act upon it promptly.

We cannot overemphasize the importance of prompt action on this tax measure, first, in order that American business and industry may know the rules of the game under which they must operate. They have a right to know, in making their plans for future investment what the tax law will be.

Another point, the Treasury Department must start printing the tax forms in order to distribute them to the taxpayers by the first of the year. The middle of October is the latest date for which they can afford to wait. They have no choice except to print them based on the law as it is today, and the law today permits the 7-percent investment tax credit. If later this year the Senate should repeal the credit it would necessitate reprinting the forms, or at least that portion of the forms dealing with

the investment credit, and mailing these corrected forms out to every taxpayer—every individual as well as every corporation, because this investment credit is available to all taxpayers who can qualify under the prescribed type of investment for equipment.

In addition, corporations and unincorporated businesses today are filing their estimated taxes. But they are including, very properly, in their estimates the fact that the investment credit is still on the books, which means that they are underpaying their taxes that would actually be due if we repeal this credit retroactively.

Even the most optimistic are not suggesting that we can get this reform package to the President's desk before the middle of December; but even if we do the Treasury Department will not be able to print the new forms and distribute them in time for the farmers and those who must file their tax returns by January 31.

I talked with a representative of the Treasury Department today and was informed that it will be necessary if we delay action longer on this investment credit, to defer the date of January 31 for payment of taxes and extend it to April or some future date, which will mean a delay in revenue coming in to the Government.

If congressional action is deferred until the end of this year it is possible that we shall have $1 billion to $1.5 billion involved in such delayed payments from business and industry. I talked to one taxpayer representing a large corporation, who said they had bought and paid for equipment since the April date mentioned in the bill, and their fiscal year is ending. They are going to take their investment credit—it amounts to about $10 million, put it in Treasury bills drawing 6 or 7 percent interest, and collect the interest until such time as Congress has decided what the tax rates are to be; then, when we do pass the law, Congress will have to give them at least 4 months, if not 6 months, to file amended returns.

Congress cannot require a penalty on such an amended return; the taxpayer cannot be asked to pay interest on an amended return for a retroactive tax which is not due the day he files his return, nor can the Treasury Department charge that man interest for the deferred payment. It is not the taxpayer's fault that Congress is dillydallying.

So we have involved here in this delayed action accumulated interest on $1 billion to $1.5 billion that the Government is losing as a result of this delay. I think that if the members of the policy committee of the majority party wish to take that responsibility they had better recognize what they are doing to the tax structure as well as what they are doing to American business. The uncertainty as to what the tax law will be that is being created for the financial community is causing a loss of jobs, and their dilatory tactics can very well precipitate us into at least a minor recession. Even though it might not be their intention, that can be the result.

I hope the Democratic policy committee will change its position and let the Senate act on this bill, which passed the House of Representatives several months ago. This bill has been approved by the Committee on Finance twice, and it is now before the Senate again. Certainly we would be derelict in our responsibility if we do not act and act quickly.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The Senator from Delaware has made some excellent points. He points out that the Treasury Department must prepare the tax return forms to go out to all individuals and businesses throughout the Nation. Treasury does not know how to prepare those forms until Congress makes up its mind what it wants to do about this matter, which passed the House of Representatives many months ago.

The Senator from Delaware also points out that, in effect, by leaving this matter open, as is being done, it creates—I guess I would not be overstating it; if I am, the Senator from Delaware will correct me—a sort of windfall for certain corporations, as he described in his statement a moment ago.

As to the point of what the Democratic policy committee should do, I take no position on that. That is up to them to decide.

As a member of the Committee on Finance, I felt I had an obligation to cast my vote to bring this bill to the floor of the Senate, and then let the Senate do what it thinks best.

The Committee on Finance feels that it should be acted upon now.

If the Senate does not feel that way, that is its privilege; but I am glad that the Finance Committee has discharged its responsibility. Its responsibility, as I saw it, as the distinguished Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON) saw it, as the distinguished Senator from Delaware saw it, and as a majority of the committee saw it, was to bring this bill to the floor of the Senate, so that it could be voted up or down, and let the Senate make a decision, so that the businessmen, the farmers, and all the other people who are affected by this investment tax credit—the Government is affected to the extent of $3.4 billion—will know where they stand. It is rather important that the Government knows where it stands in relation to this revenue, so that the businesses will know where they stand in relation to capital improvements. Those capital improvements create additional job opportunities.

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

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I enjoyed very much the comments made by the distinguished Senators from Virginia and Delaware. The Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS) has also done excellent work right along on a most important project.

I congratulate the Senators.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the kind remarks of the Senator from New Mexico.

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

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, one of the arguments that has been made—and I do not question the sincerity of those asking for delayed action—is that if the Senate acts on the investment tax credit it may affect later action on the so-called tax reform bill.

Mr. President, I disagree completely with that argument because in the reform bill that is still pending in the committee there are provisions providing for the extension of the excise taxes on both automobiles and telephones, which expire on January 1. That involves about $2.5 billion, as I recall.

The question of the surtax extension is involved.

There is no question in the mind of a single member of the Finance Committee or of any Member of the Senate that the so-called tax reform measure will be before the Senate and will be acted upon this year.

I have been a member of the Committee on Finance for more than 20 years. It has been the policy of that committee throughout all of that period of time, and even before, that no major bill should ever be bottled up in the committee in order to keep the Senate from acting on the measure and working its will.

Mr. President, to cite one example, I refer to the so-called medicare and medicaid bill in which matter the then chairman of the committee was the father of the present senior Senator from Virginia, and I was the ranking minority member.

We both supported the reporting of the bill to the Senate even though at the time we joined in minority views on the bill because we were opposed to certain provisions. However, we believed that the Senate had a right to have an opportunity to vote on the matter and work its will on the bill.

Our committee has never bottled up a bill in committee. There is no question of the bill's being bottled up. The bill is going to come before the Senate at the earliest practical date.

But I agree fully with the distinguished Senator from Virginia that this is far too important a bill to say, as some have said, that we will report it by "X" date whether it is ready to be reported or not.

We are dealing with a proposal to change the rates of the taxation for much of American industry, and this bill requires careful committee consideration before it is brought to the Senate.

A tax bill of such far-reaching proportions cannot be written on the floor of the Senate. That does not mean undue delay, but I will not be bound to report a bill by any date certain. Already our committee has lost several days as the result of the death of one of our Members.

But Senators who are so anxious for prompt action can just relax and be assured that they definitely will have the bill before the Senate in time to act, and I only hope that their enthusiasm prevails when the time comes to vote.

Major tax measures should be given careful consideration and thought by the members of the committee before they are reported to the Senate. That would

not mean delay. I think that if we do our work well in the committee we shall move faster when we get to the floor of the Senate.

I think that one of the most constructive steps that could be made to get early consideration of the tax bill would be to move the investment tax credit forward now and get it out of the way. At the same time our committee will keep working diligently, day after day, as we are doing, to complete the hearings on the major tax reform bill and get it before the Senate.

In the meantime the Senate has 12 appropriation bills on which no action has been taken. The Senate should move those forward and get them acted on so that when we do get the tax reform bill before the Senate, we will have cleared the deck so that we can move quickly to consider the matter.

Unless these appropriation bills are promptly acted upon we shall find that when the tax bill is reported we will have a logjam on the Senate Calendar and then be unable to get action on the tax bill. Perhaps this is what some who oppose this tax reform bill wish. The truth is that with a little more orderly arrangement of the business of the Senate, with all of us working together, we can get the job done much faster than if the Senate fiddles around, as it has been doing by taking 10 weeks to pass one bill, and then in the last few weeks tries to stampede all the major bills through the Senate without proper consideration.

The Senator from Virginia was perfectly proper in saying that this deliberate delay will result in unwarranted windfalls to many segments of our industry. If so, it will be our fault. Taxpayers will very properly take advantage of the investment credit deduction in their estimated and final returns as long as the provision has not been repealed. They do not know what the Senate will do. Nevertheless, the interest alone on the $1 billion or $1.5 billion involved in these delayed collections is a staggering sum of money. It is money that we could use to much better advantage.

Let those who would deliberately delay action on this bill dealing with the 7-percent investment credit accept full responsibility for the chaos they are creating.

Significantly, the Senate Finance Committee has by an overwhelming vote repudiated their delaying tactics.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware is quite correct in my judgment when he says that the Senate Finance Committee will report a tax reform bill.

For the life of me, I cannot understand the logic of not voting on the investment tax credit. I cannot see how anyone is benefited by keeping this whole question of whether or not the investment tax credit will be repealed. Who would gain by delay? Certainly the Government does not gain by it. Certainly business does not gain by it, because they do not know how to plan. Certainly those who want jobs do not gain by it, because if business does not know how to plan, it cannot buy the machinery with which to create the jobs. Certainly the taxpayers do not gain by delay.

I fail to see how it would be helpful to anyone if we were not to bring the legislation to a vote.

The Senator from Delaware mentioned one matter with which I do not associate myself. That is his suggestion on what he feels the Democratic policy committee should do. Of course, the Senator is entitled to his viewpoint. However, that is one part of his statement, and the only part of his statement, on which I do not want to express my view.

From my point of view, that is a matter to be decided by the Democratic leadership. My concern was that the Finance Committee exercise its responsibility and bring the matter to the floor.

If the Senate does not want to take it up, if the Senate wants it to stay here, if the Senate wants to have the business community completely upset, and if the Senate does not want to tell the farmers whether or not when they purchase new tractors, trucks, and various other types of equipment they will be allowed an investment credit, that is up to the Senate.

The Senate Finance Committee has, as I see it, discharged its responsibility when it brings the bill to the floor of the Senate. The Senate itself now can decide what it wants to do.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Virginia. The membership of the Senate Finance Committee, as I recall, with but one dissenting vote, voted to instruct the chairman of the committee and me as the ranking minority member to try to persuade the leadership of the Senate of the importance of bringing the bill promptly to the floor for a vote.

I hope that we can prevail on them to take action on the matter before it results in an unwarranted loss in revenue. Enough damage has already been done.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE FISCAL KNIFE ON NIH RESEARCH

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOK in the chair). The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of September 16, 1969, under the headline "The Fiscal Knife on NIH Research," describes the administration's drastic reduction in the 1970 budget requests for the National Institutes of Health. It refers to the severe loss to humanity by the proposed closing of 19 general clinical research centers throughout the country next year because of lack of funds. Almost half of these are pediatric centers, which have been making important advances in improving the health care of babies and small children. The editorial concludes:

> In putting the fiscal knife to medical research, the recovery may take a lot longer than the original cutting.

I point out that it is particularly tragic when they cut down on these research centers which are searching for ways in which to improve the health care of babies and small children. America ranks as the 16th nation among all the nations on earth in infant mortality; 15 other nations on earth have better records on infant mortality than we have. In some countries of Western Europe, the number of infant deaths are only half the number in the United States.

A news item in the New York Times of September 15, 1969, indicates that a major research program at the National Cancer Institute has been forced to destroy 380 valuable monkeys under study in a multimillion-dollar search for human cancer viruses because of a shortage of funds.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, I have been in communication with many of the leaders in cancer research, and they were about to make some important studies in the relationship of virus caused cancer. They thought they were about to make some breakthroughs in a few years. But the article in the New York Times of September 15 indicates that the institute, which was hoping to make a breakthrough, had to kill 380 valuable monkeys because there is no money to carry forward this research, and they had to let the researchers go. It is a tragic cutback. It is tragic to America that this research has been stopped in the effort to find an answer to the curse of cancer, which causes so much suffering in this land.

I find the lack of fiscal responsibility as evidenced in these two articles very difficult to comprehend in view of President Nixon's warning earlier this year that—

> This Nation is faced with a breakdown in the delivery of health care unless immediate concerted action is taken by government and the private sector.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial published in the Washington Post of September 16, 1969, and the news item published in the New York Times of September 15, 1969, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Washington Post editorial refers to the precarious financial condition of our medical schools which will be affected by these cutbacks. Greater demands are being made of them in the face of rapidly mounting operating costs and less adequate financial resources for the maintenance of programs and the construction and renovation of facilities. It is imperative that Congress and the Federal agencies share this concern if we are to maintain the present position of American medical education and our contributions to the medical sciences while simultaneously moving forward to meet the great needs of the future.

The Health Manpower Act of 1968, which is administered by the National Institutes of Health, provides a mechanism for medical schools to increase the output of health manpower through institutional and special project grants. Federal support for the construction and renovation of educational facilities is also vitally essential if they are to meet the health manpower needs of the country. Funds are required to replace facilities which are obsolete or unsuited to programs under development. Additionally,

there is an urgent need for funds for student loans and for health research facilities. Medical schools are complex institutions, with a great number of interrelated and interdependent programs. Each program interacts with and is essential to the others. It is not possible to isolate programs in undergraduate medical education, biomedical research and research training, the education and training of interns and residents, the delivery of medical care to the community, or efforts to extend and make more effective the methods for delivery of health services. Rapid downward changes in emphasis or the level of support in one program will have serious consequences for all these programs aiming at better health of the American people.

Congress can make every effort to see that sufficient funding is provided to carry out these programs in the interest of improvement of medical education, medical research, and the health care delivery system, but no headway toward this end can be made when the administration takes steps in advance of the passage of an appropriation bill to effect cutbacks which were described by Dr. Philip Handler, president of the National Academy of Sciences, as a "crisis facing all American science." After the evidence of wide public concern, I was amazed to read the administration's description of its intent:

As a prudent step to avoid prejudicing future decisions, we made a temporary withholding of 20 percent on this limited number of continuation grants until the picture was somewhat clearer.

This explanation is given in spite of the fact that there has been an attrition in the research effort since 1966. Not only have the program funds been reduced, but also, in consideration of the inflationary factor and the increased need for sophisticated equipment and facilities, the funds provided do not make any provision for needed advancement. It is most regrettable to me to find that the expression of concern by the administration of the health care needs of the country is not reflected in its support of funds to deliver an adequate health program. On the contrary, because of these drastic and disastrous cuts, the research institutes are forced to close down their activities.

Mr. President, while we have been shocked by that, I have an AP wire of today which contains even worse news. I read now from an Associated Press wire just taken off the ticker, from a Washington release:

The Nixon Administration has extended its controversial health program cutbacks to five projects that apply research gains to patient treatment for chronic diseases, including cancer.

This is today's announcement, Mr. President.

Budget authorities in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have ordered drastic cuts this year, and termination next year, of the chronic disease programs involving cancer, respiratory ailments, diabetes, arthritis, heart and stroke, and neurological and sensory disorders.

Mr. President, there will be a cut this year and an abandonment next year of these programs in cancer, stroke, and heart disease, the three great killers, for which the great Senator from Alabama (Mr. HILL) worked for decades.

The release continues:

Dr. Stanley W. Olson, director of HEW's regional medical programs service, confirmed that five of eight units in his chronic disease division will lose more than half of their funds this year. Current plans are to drop them next year at a savings of $9.7 million, he said.

The latest cuts follows announcement of plans by the national institutes of health to pare 5 to 10 per cent from medical research outlays and to eliminate up to 19 small clinical research centers across the country.

The new budget restrictions are expected to increase already vocal protests from the medical community and some congressional leaders.

I predict that they will produce more than vocal protest from the medical community. I think the medical community is entitled to great credit for the research it is doing in trying to find the answer to the great killers—heart disease, cancer, and stroke.

I know that the present occupant of the Chair must have knowledge of how much these research institutes help in this effort, because he comes from a city of great medical learning.

Mr. President, the cutbacks and the destruction of research in the cause of a cure for heart disease, cancer, stroke, respiratory ailments, diabetes, arthritis, and other disorders, as announced by the administration today, are the most shortsighted of all the shortsighted cutbacks on health programs by the Nixon administration. Heart disease, cancer, and stroke are the worst killers of the American people. They are three things to which Congress directed its attention, year after year, with increasing support, to try to find the answer. Now we find that they will be cut back drastically this year and many of these programs will be terminated next year.

All the hopes of millions of Americans suffering from heart disease, cancer, and stroke are being shattered by the reckless dissolution of the health research facilities by this administration.

Respiratory diseases, diabetes, arthritis, and neurological and sensory diseases are being researched, but that research has felt the ax of this administration. Those sufferers are often condemned to a slow death or disability, and now they must suffer without the hope of a remedy being found through research that was going on, and without the hope that in their lifetime some relief would be found from the pain and disability.

It is shocking that an administration could be so callous with respect to the future health and well being of the American people.

Mr. President, as a member of the Appropriations Committee and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, I will do all in my power to try to save these programs which have been worked out through so many Congresses and so many administrations to try to find the cause and cure of these killer diseases. The American people are now without an answer and without a means to find relief from pain, death, and to find relief from diabetes, emphysema—that disease increased 80 percent in the last few years—and other diseases. This administration is turning its back on those problems. These programs are being cut down this year and closed next year.

The edict is given to all in this wire dispatch and worse news could come with respect to the cutbacks in research for health and the search for better health for the American people.

This is utterly shocking and I do not understand it. It is almost beyond belief that the administration would take this action. Any administration has the obligation to help preserve and protect.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 16, 1969]

THE FISCAL KNIFE ON NIH RESEARCH

The fiscal knife which the administration says it is forced to wield because of inflation and Vietnam cut into medical research last week. Taking its place among the agencies whose funds are either being cut or pared by President Nixon's call for a $3.5 billion reduction in 1970 budget requests is the National Institutes of Health. Total spending on medical research—in hospitals, universities and the NIH Bethesda labs—will be down from $1.93 billion to $1.64 billion, a cut of $290 million.

Although medical and scientific researchers are often inclined to be a wolf! wolf! crowd whose sheep are not only under no attack but are often overfat to begin with, the abruptness of the present NIH cut does suggest that a wolf is near. Most immediately affected by the cut will be 19 clinical research centers. In a style similar to its closing of 59 Job Corps centers earlier this year, the administration expects to save money. But savings aside, where will the doctors go who have been conducting the research at the 19 centers? What about the diseased patients who will be phased out because money has run out? Or the millions of future sick people who will not benefit tomorrow because research into their particular disease was cut off today? In one area alone, an estimated 30,000 infants die every year in the period immediately surrounding delivery because basic research is not fully advanced in this area.

Aside from the research that is to be stopped without waiting for results, medical schools—with a heavy leaning on the government for research grants—will also be hit, both students and faculty. The danger of turning off the medical research motor is that it is not so easily started again. It is true, the 19 centers to be closed have only a handful of patients, but this is where basic biomedical research begins. It then fans out to advance research and, often, eventual use in the medical community.

It has long been a question whether medical schools and research clinics should have let themselves become so dependent on federal funds in the first place; but few other resources exist, either among foundations, which generally do not support medical research, or the drug companies, which by the nature of things are in the business more for profit than public service.

Although the Senate can appropriate more money for NIH than the administration requests, this does not mean the administration must or will spend it. Aside from the medical research programs themselves, what suffers also in this abrupt fund cut is the administration's sincerity in facing the health crisis. "The nation is faced with a breakdown in the delivery of health care," it said only two months ago in a major White House report. Now, it seems, in order to save money that could be saved in, say, cutting back on aircraft carriers or bombers, the administration is helping, not relieving, the breakdown. In putting the fiscal knife to

medical research, the recovery may take a lot longer than the original cutting.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 15, 1969]

INSTITUTE TO KILL CANCER MONKEYS—SHORTAGE OF FUNDS BLAMED IN DEATH OF 380 ANIMALS

(By Harold M. Schmeck, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, Sept. 14.—A major research program at the National Cancer Institute has been forced to order 380 valuable monkeys killed because of a shortage of funds.

The monkeys are part of a research colony of about 1,400. When the 380 monkeys were born about five years ago, they were inoculated with material from human cancers suspected of being caused by viruses. The animals were to be kept alive for at least seven years while scientists studied them for any signs of cancer development.

From what scientists know of cancer, they would not suspect malignancies to develop in any of the animals within five years. Thus, the monkeys are being killed just at the point at which they might have helped scientists to learn whether viruses cause cancer in humans.

$2-MILLION INVESTMENT

Besides their value to research, the monkeys represent a considerable financial investment to the institute, one of the National Institutes of Health. It costs about $3 a day to care for each animal. Over a span of five years, this totals more than $2-million.

Earlier this year, the institute had to give away about 500 other monkeys to research centers that could afford to keep them. These animals represented about half of a breeding colony that was considered particularly important to the research program.

Dr. Frank J. Rauscher Jr., an associate scientific director of the institute and head of its cancer virus program, confirmed in a recent interview that he had ordered the cutback in the size of the monkey colony. He added that a shortage of funds had curtailed some current projects and had limited the program's ability to explore new fields.

Dr. Rauscher also said he believes it is proper that the program should have to compete with other research efforts for Federal funds. And he suggested that the program ought to be in a good position because of the progress it has made in recent years and because of the importance of cancer as a health problem.

GRANT FROM CONGRESS

The multimillion-dollar search for human cancer viruses was started about five years ago with an initial grant of $10-million from Congress.

Viruses are known to be the causes of many types of animal cancer and circumstantial evidence has suggested that this is also true of some cancers in humans.

Doctors close to the program believe the search for human cancer viruses is coming close to fruition. The search for these still-hypothetical villains has involved a broad spectrum of research studies. Research with primates is only a part of it, but an important part.

Although few types of virus have been suspected of contributing to cancer in humans, the final proof has been difficult to obtain. This is partly because it is morally impossible to inject human beings with suspected cancer viruses.

BENEFITS SEEN

To get around that problem research workers have turned to man's close relatives in the animal kingdom. If monkeys infected with viruses from human cancers developed the same type of cancer themselves, this would be impressive evidence.

Furthermore, the growth of such viruses in animals could help provide large quantities of viruses for further research and development of experimental vaccines.

Dr. Rauscher said research in the last several years has all but erased suspicion about a group of viruses called adenoviruses, and has fixed it on other types, some of which were not suspected when the program began.

Among these are viruses of the herpes type; they are related in structure and chemistry but are not identical to a virus that causes cold sores.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to attend the Development Assistance Committee Parliamentarians Conference of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—OECD—to be held at Paris, France, on October 23 and 24, 1969: the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), and the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS).

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to attend the annual meetings of the Boards of Governors of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, to be held at Washington, D.C., September 29 to October 3, 1969: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN) as as advisers; the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER) as observers.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senator to attend the 13th session, International Lead and Zinc Study Group, to be held at Geneva, Switzerland, convening October 6, 1969: the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG).

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, under the provisions of Public Law 84–689, appoints the following Senators to attend the North Atlantic Assembly, to be held at Brussels, Belgium, on October 16 to 21, 1969: the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), chairman; the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS).

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to attend the 13th session, General Conference of International Atomic Energy Agency, to be held at Vienna, Austria, September 23 to 29, 1969: the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN).

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to attend the 15th session of the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization, to be held at Rome, Italy, convening November 8, 1969: the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER).

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to section 276 of title 22 of United States Code, appoints the following Senators to attend the meeting of the Interparliamentary Union, at New Delhi, India, to be held October 20 through November 7, 1969: the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), chairman; the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS).

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President also appoints the same Senators to serve as an official Senate delegation, under the provisions of Senate Resolution 65, as agreed to February 17, 1969, to respond to invitations officially received from foreign governments or parliamentary bodies, to visit in their countries while proceeding to and from New Delhi, with the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), as chairman.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, attendance at the various conferences just announced by the Chair represents an important obligation on the part of the U.S. Senate. Those Members scheduled to attend are performing a vital service to this institution and to the Nation. I want the record to show that their participation, often undertaken at great sacrifice to their personal schedule, is both noted and appreciated.

DIRECT POPULAR ELECTION

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the passage yesterday of the House bill for direct popular election, by a vote of 339 to 70, was an encouraging, dramatic, and historic event. This overwhelming victory was a tribute to the dedication and hard work of a bipartisan group led by Chairman CELLER, Representative MCCULLOCH, Speaker MCCORMACK, Majority Leader ALBERT, and Minority Leader GERALD FORD, and the great majority of Members of the House of Representatives. It also is a tribute to the willingness of Members of the other body to cooperate.

The House passage was particularly significant because it showed that most House Members, whether advocates of direct popular election, the district plan, or the proportional plan, realized that the present electoral system was so frought with danger and so undemocratic that it had to be changed. There was a tremendous number of crossovers in the House—Congressmen who were not advocates of direct popular election originally. I think that shows the seriousness

with which the Representatives view the need for reform. When these men were confronted with the choice of direct popular election or no reform at all, they realized that they could not permit the inequities and the dangers of the electoral college system to continue.

The district plan and the proportional plan have been around for a long time and since their high water mark of 1956, they have not gained any strength. Direct election, in contrast, has made great gains since I took up this struggle in May 1966 with only a handful of cosponsors. Support has mushroomed. The Gallup poll indicated that 81 percent of the people in the United States wanted direct popular election. The House vote indicated 82 percent of the House of Representatives wanted direct popular election. The poll by the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN) of 27 State legislatures, in those States considered most likely not to vote for direct election, indicated that the legislatures of 25 of these 27 States did in fact favor direct election.

Mr. President, I would like to point out at this time that the Senator from Michigan in his poll of the State legislatures made one of the most significant contributions in this period of time in what the Senate and the House had been deliberating on this issue. Because of the significance of the contribution by the Senator from Michigan, at this time I ask unanimous consent to add the name of the junior Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN) as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, a recent survey taken by Nations Business of the speakers and majority leaders of major legislatures showed that the leaders of most favored direct election.

The newly appointed Senator from Illinois (Mr. SMITH) has announced that he favors direct election.

As I have just announced, I have received permission to add and we have added the name of the Senator from Michigan as a cosponsor to this direct election proposal. This means 43 Senators, including the distinguished Presiding Officer (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia) and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK) who serves on my subcommittee. Both of them have been very helpful in the discussions and debates in the subcommittee. Hopefully they are going to continue in their efforts in having the proposal agreed to by the full committee.

I have written a letter recently to newspaper publishers and editors, radio and television stations throughout the United States about the prospects of electoral reform. The response has been overwhelmingly in favor of direct election, not just in the editorials and invitations to appear on programs, but from people who have read the editorials or heard these programs. Americans want electoral reform.

To date, we have not had the active support of President Nixon. In February, the President said that he still agreed with his statement during the campaign—that he personally favored direct election, but felt it did not have the best chance of passing. The President indicated, however, that he would back any plan the Congress passed. I hope the President will not wait for Senate passage of electoral reform to give us his active support. I think the House vote is indicative of the broad-based support the measure has throughout the United States. I would welcome the President's assistance in securing the necessary two-thirds in the Senate and three-fourths of the State legislatures. He has indicated that he thinks reform of the electoral college is essential. We invite his active participation. If we are to have reform before 1972, we must act now—and direct popular election is the front-runner and the plan most likely to succeed.

I want to be frank concerning direct election's chances in the Senate. Electoral college reform will come before the Judiciary Committee in the next week or two, as soon as the Haynsworth nomination is disposed of. I am confident that it will pass in committee and will be reported to the floor of the Senate.

The situation on the floor of the Senate is a tenuous one. I know that more Senators support direct election of the President than any other plan. But I cannot honestly say if we have the necessary two-thirds needed for passage.

I am hopeful that the Senate Members, who now favor one of the alternative plans will follow the example set by many House Members, in the end be convinced that electoral reform is needed and, thus, will support Senate Joint Resolution 1—the direct election of the President.

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

Mr. BAYH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Indiana, who has not only written a book on this subject, but who has done more work on it, I suspect, than any other Member of the Senate.

One of the main reasons I would like to associate myself with his remarks is that I believe the time has come for the American voter who walks in and casts his vote on election day to have his vote counted. He does not want his vote taken from the back of the machine, diluted by a formula, divided by some system, relegated to some meeting weeks later when someone goes to the State capital, where he might do as the individual wanted him to do or he might not do it.

I believe that the American voter is no longer content with a system whereby after he finishes casting his vote, he must live in suspense wondering whether a winner can become a loser or a loser can become a winner. He no longer wants to be a part of that system.

I think the opportunity has now come for Members of the Senate to determine for themselves how the people in their respective States feel on this subject.

It was a privilege and a pleasure for me to go on the subcommittee of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) for several reasons. Not only because I so enthusiastically support the direct election proposal as exemplified in Senate Resolution 1, but also because as we move in this direction, we move toward another one of those items of national interest in which I am so vitally involved; namely, that the entire Nation should take the position which the Commonwealth of Kentucky took many years ago in establishing, once and for all, that the 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds are an integral and absolute part of our society. We gave them the right to vote years ago. That right should be extended to them all over this Nation.

I think that this is a step in the right direction. As we begin to make people realize the importance of direct elections, and the importance of their association in the political realm of this entire Nation, the better off we will be as a true and functioning democracy, now and in the future.

I am pleased to associate myself, as I said, with the remarks of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, it certainly is thoughtful, as usual, of the Senator from Kentucky, to be so generous.

As I said earlier, we appreciate his cooperation and support. We also appreciate the cooperation and support of the Senator from West Virginia and, indeed, of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), who has just now come into the Chamber.

I think we have the best chance we ever had in the history of this country, to make a decided effort and succeed in reforming the electoral system.

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

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

PRESIDENT NIXON'S ANNOUNCEMENT ON LOWERING DRAFT CALLS AND THE RETIREMENT OF GENERAL HERSHEY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this morning, President Nixon announced that draft calls will be substantially lower for the balance of this year than they have been during the previous 9 months. The October call of 29,000 men will be spread over October, November, and December, and the calls originally planned for the latter 2 months cancelled. This lowering of draft calls reflects the administration's decision to withdraw 35,000 more troops from Vietnam. It is clearly most welcome, and I have urged as high policy on Vietnam, continued withdrawal of additional Armed Forces to the extent of 100,000 by 1970 and 200,000 by the end of 1970, permitting continuation of a lower level of draft calls during 1970.

Welcome as is the reduction in draft calls, reduction in the number called will hardly cure the deficiencies and inequities inherent in our present draft system. I have previously introduced a bill, S.

992, to carry out what I believe to be the basic reforms necessary to make the Selective Service System a more equitable, more efficient program. Many of my colleagues have also introduced draft reform legislation and the President has been on record since last spring as calling on the Congress to authorize the use of a lottery and the selection of 19-year-olds first. The President also announced this morning that if Congress fails to act on his program he will issue an Executive order reversing the current order of call so that 19-year-olds would be called first. While a lottery would require congressional authorization, a simple reversal of the order of call to establish 19-year-olds as the prime selection group would not.

In the absence of prompt congressional action, I would certainly support any efforts by the administration to change existing policy by the Executive order. Yet, I think we in Congress would be gravely remiss in our duties if we did not promptly address ourselves to the problem of draft reform. Much more is involved than just the drafting of 19-year-olds first or the use of a lottery.

Among the questions which deserve immediate attention are the lottery, the equitability of our present policy concerning deferments, the need for uniformity in classification and deferment, the status of conscientious objectors and the need for modernizing the whole Selective Service System along the lines suggested by the Marshall commission.

Finally, I note that the President did not comment on recent reports that he would shortly ask General Hershey to retire as Director of the Selective Service System. Mr. President, I think the time has come for General Hershey to consider retiring, because, rightly or wrongly, General Hershey has come to symbolize much of what is wrong with the present draft system.

In view of General Hershey's record of rigid resistance to any meaningful draft reform, his efforts to use the draft as punishment against young people who have engaged in protest activities, and his recent attempt to dominate the National Selective Service Appeals Board, if this administration is sincerely interested in reforming the draft and convincing the public—particularly the youth who are subject to the draft—of its sincerity in doing so, a successor to General Hershey should be found as soon as possible.

BANKS PLEDGE TO SUPPORT GUARANTEED STUDENT LOANS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, last month the distinguished chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Senator PELL of Rhode Island, and I, as the principal sponsor of the guaranteed student loan bill which passed the Senate on August 12, wired all the banking clearinghouses in the Nation to urge their assistance in convincing banks immediately to extend guaranteed student loans. Noting that some 900,000 young people will seek to utilize guaranteed student loans for the academic year now beginning and that 220,000 of them may be forced to discontinue their education if these loans are unavailable because of high interest rates, we urged the banking community to continue offering the loans "to the maximum extent feasible."

Uniformly favorable and encouraging responses were received. Those responding included 11 clearinghouses and two regional bankers' associations as well as a number of individual banks. Clearinghouses sending favorable letters were the St. Louis Clearing House Association, the Portland, Oreg., Clearing House, the Los Angeles Clearing House Association, the Boston Clearing House Association, the San Francisco Clearing House Association, the Baltimore Clearing House, the Phoenix Clearing House Association, the Philadelphia Clearing House, the Kansas City Clearing House Association, the New Bedford Clearing House Association, and the New York Clearing House.

The two associations were the Long Island Bankers Association and the District of Columbia Bankers Association.

The individual banks were Bankers Trust Co., the Chemical Bank, the Franklin National Bank, Marine Midland Grace Trust Co of New York, Security National Bank, all of New York State; and the Peoples Bank of Green Bay, Wis.; the Oregon Bank, of Portland; the Lakewood Bank & Trust Co., Dallas; the Old Kent Bank & Trust Co., Grand Rapids; and the Civic Plaza National Bank, Kansas City.

While much of the effort of the banking community indicated by these responses is heartening, particularly noteworthy is the effort of the Franklin National Bank, which advertised in major newspapers in the New York City and Long Island area it serves that it has increased the money available for student loans to the extent of 10,000 new loans. This is a notable contribution for which the bank's president, Harold V. Gleason, and his colleagues merit the approbation of the community. I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks the text of this advertisement.

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

[From Newsday, Aug. 25, 1969]

10,000 NEW STUDENT LOANS

We didn't have time to prepare a fancy ad. We want to rush out the news. Franklin National Bank will make 10,000 new student loans. (Under the New York State Higher Education Program.) Residents of Long Island and New York City.

Here's where to apply: 600 Old Country Road, Roosevelt Field, Garden City, New York; 730 Veteran's Memorial Highway, Hauppauge, New York; 209 W. Main Street, Riverhead, New York; 461 8th Avenue at 34th Street, New York, New York.

FRANKLIN NATIONAL BANK.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in wiring the clearinghouses, Senator PELL and I expressed our confidence that shortly after the conclusion of the Labor Day recess Congress would enact the necessary legislation to provide for incentive payments to lending institutions to meet the problems caused them by record-high interest rates.

The House of Representatives on Monday, September 15, approved its version of the bill, and it is anticipated that the first conference session will convene within a week. I am hopeful that the House-Senate differences will be resolved expeditiously.

THE PHILADELPHIA PLAN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have previously discussed on the floor of the Senate the revised Philadelphia plan and the recent ruling of the Comptroller General concerning the validity of the plan, which ruling I believe to be clearly erroneous and an abuse of the Comptroller General's authority. In my view, any questions pertaining to the legality of the plan ought to be settled in the courts, and I therefore am in full agreement with Secretary Shultz' decision to implement the plan notwithstanding the Comptroller General's ruling.

Mr. President, I find it regrettable indeed that the Labor Department found it necessary to promulgate a scheme such as the revised Philadelphia plan. I also know that a great deal of progress has been made by many building trades unions in reaching minority groups and increasing the number of minority group participants in various apprenticeship programs. Certainly I would not want my support of the revised Philadelphia plan to be understood as any blanket condemnation of the building and construction industry. Yet, Mr. President, we cannot close our eyes to the reality that our objective of open employment opportunity is far from realization. A recent article by Lyn Shepard appearing in the Christian Science Monitor of September 9, 1969, indicates the nature of the problem which still exists in the industry and the reasons why the revised Philadelphia plan is an important and necessary step which must be taken if we are successfully to remedy once and for all the problem of insuring equal employment opportunity in this vital segment of the economy.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I have also expressed my sentiments in support of the Secretary of Labor's decision to go ahead with the plan, notwithstanding the Comptroller General's ruling, in a letter to the Secretary in which 11 of my colleagues in the Senate have joined. I ask unanimous consent that the letter, which was dated August 13, 1969, also be printed in the RECORD.

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

UNITED STATES PRESSES BUILDING-UNION DRIVE

(By Lyn Shepard)

WASHINGTON.—The Nixon administration is undergoing a rugged test of its resolve to end job bias in the building trades.

If it holds its ground and eventually wins, it will amount to a great bread-and-butter victory for black craftsmen, as well as other excluded minority workers.

For nowhere in America are the patterns of prejudice more stubborn—as this reporter has seen during a three-month nationwide study of job-discrimination trends—than in the craft-union hiring halls.

It is toward this target that Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz aims his revised "Philadelphia plan."

A month ago, Mr. Shultz vowed to carry out this controversial plan over the objections of the comptroller general.

The plan sets "numerical goals" for minority-group hiring on federal-aid construction projects costing more than $500,000. Contractors must agree to these goals in writing before winning a contract.

WIDER USE SIGHTED

Conservatives in Congress still advance the comptroller general's legal argument. They contend that "numerical goals" are in fact racial quotas. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 expressly forbids such quotas.

Yet the plan remains in effect. Soon it may extend to other cities besides Philadelphia where the building trades have systematically closed their doors to minorities.

In the meantime, both the plan's advocates in the civil-rights field and its critics among contractors and unionists are following every Labor Department move for signs of a letup in pressure.

"We're being watched by those who want us to succeed and by those who want us to fail," says Assistant Secretary of Labor Arthur A. Fletcher.

Mr. Fletcher, who sometimes greets newsmen in work khakis, has been placed in charge of the government's new contract-compliance crackdown.

"I think the ball game can be won or lost before a contract is ever awarded," he told me before the Philadelphia plan was revived July 18. "The preaward conference [during which "numerical goals" are set] is the proper time to get commitments from contractors to correct hiring deficiencies."

TIMING STRESSED

"The pattern has been to get this [minority exclusion] corrected in the contractors' affirmative-action plans after the award. Actually this should have been settled in the preaward stage. If you drive for a commitment then, you'll get instant results."

It was this logic—bulwarked by Attorney General John N. Mitchell's approval of the Philadelphia plan's legal aspects—which caused Mr. Shultz to dismiss the comptroller general's opinion.

Actually some federal officials have held informal preaward conferences in St. Louis, Cleveland, and other cities for several years. The Philadelphia plan lends new impetus to their efforts.

Mr. Fletcher has directed the Office of Federal Contract Compliance's area coordinators to zero in on seven "critical crafts": iron workers, plumbers, steamfitters, sheet-metal workers, electricians, roofers (and waterproofers), and elevator-construction workers.

In these high-paying skills, Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and Mexican-Americans have only recently attained journeyman status in many AFL–CIO locals. And even today, these inroads barely meet the level of tokenism.

NAACP STARTS ACTIONS

Just recently the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People announced a series of legal actions aimed at stopping work on federally financed construction unless qualified blacks were employed on the projects.

In announcing the move, Roy M. Wilkins Jr., NAACP executive director, described the building-trades unions as the "last bastion against employment of Negro workers as a policy."

Often union politics plays an important part in the timing of federal antibias decrees. Government agents try to avoid aiding white-backlash campaigns for union office. As a rule of thumb, they have learned not to apply pressure on the locals during the electioneering period.

"Sometimes I'll have to tell Washington, 'No, let's wait a week before pushing on this one,'" one federal official in a Northern city explains.

"I have to weigh whether the pressure I apply to the union president may weaken his position with the rank and file to the point that a rival will play on the 'soft-on-the-niggers' issue enough to beat him. Very often an election is decided on 'which one of us hates the niggers worse.'"

If a Negro has finally gained entry into the local, federal sources say, such blatant shows of racism will not occur so openly. But in subtler ways, in opportune moments, smaller groups within the membership will congregate and rehash the issue in much the same way.

"It may be in the corridors, in the shower rooms, in the parking lots," one astute observer of union activity says, "but it's the same old story."

TINDERBOX SITUATION RECALLED

In two major industrial cities, Chicago and Pittsburgh, the black-white confrontation on building sites today threatens to erupt in a violent racial clash.

These crises recall a similar tinderbox situation three years ago at a federal-building project in East St. Louis, Ill. Civil-rights groups picketed because the building trades were completely white. Angered by the protesters, the unions threatened to counterpicket.

When the project excavation got underway, racial hostility in the 70 percent black city had built up to an explosive level. At this point, a showdown session occurred between the prime contractor, his subcontractors, and Robert Harlan, a Washington spokesman for the General Services Administration (GSA).

"Harlan didn't mince words," an on-the-spot witness recalled. "He gave the prime contractor a clear ultimatum. 'Sir, you will have Negroes in every craft union involved on the project within 10 days or lose the contract.'"

CRASH PROGRAM PUT THROUGH

A crash program to meet the GSA envoy's terms took form immediately. One of its participants told me of those hectic days in 1966.

"We worked day and night for two weeks," he said. "By day we set up joint apprenticeship committees for each of the unions. In the evening, we recruited Negroes for the program. We screened applicants late into the night. Somehow we met Harlan's goal because none of us wanted to see bloodshed. We felt it was a matter of survival."

On occasion, tough negotiators like Mr. Harlan can reform an entire city's building-trades hiring patterns—and do it almost overnight.

More often, though, as in Boston, the federal compliance program has proved a sham. Critics there describe the process as "a cruel joke." Paper work documenting biased hiring patterns has grown voluminous over the years. Still, nothing seems to come of the stacks of reports once they reach Washington.

In the Labor Department, Assistant Secretary Fletcher says he does not expect to force change easily or even as quickly as he would like.

But in the Philadelphia plan, he figures Washington has a vigorous national strategy to conquer bigotry in the building trades—if it's allowed to use it.

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., August 13, 1969.

Hon. GEORGE P. SHULTZ,
Secretary of Labor.
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY SHULTZ: We commend your decision to implement the Revised Philadelphia Plan and join you in the expectation that the Plan will be successful in assuring equal employment opportunity in the building and construction industry. The Plan presents legal issues of fundamental importance to the success of the equal employment opportunity program under Executive Order 11246, and the recent ruling of the Comptroller General concerning the Plan would, if given effect, undermine the entire executive order program. Congress did not give the Comptroller General the authority to administer and interpret Executive Order 11246 or the Civil Rights Act of 1964; rather, it placed that authority in the Justice Department, which has approved the Plan, and, ultimately, the courts. Any issues concerning the legality of the Plan under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 should, therefore, be resolved by the courts, which have the requisite authority and knowledge to interpret the Act and the Executive Order, and not by the Comptroller General.

On our part, we shall certainly oppose any effort to enact legislation which would prohibit the Department of Labor from proceeding to implement the Revised Philadelphia Plan or to block a court test of the legality of the Plan.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

EDWARD W. BROOKE, JACOB K. JAVITS, ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, FRED R. HARRIS, BIRCH BAYH, PHILIP A. HART, CLIFFORD P. CASE, VANCE HARTKE, WALTER F. MONDALE, CHARLES E. GOODELL, EDWARD M. KENNEDY, U.S. Senators.

DR. MARY CALDERONE LATEST TARGET OF JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the latest target of the John Birch Society appears to be the Sex Information and Education Council of the United States—an organization founded to publish sex education study guides for teachers and advise schools and agencies how to set up such programs.

SIECUS, a nonprofit organization, was founded 5 years ago by a distinguished New Yorker, Dr. Mary Calderone. Its board of directors includes physicians, educators, and clergymen.

I am particularly disturbed that the Birch Society attack has focused, in a personal way, on Dr. Calderone. The daughter of Edward Steichen, the photographer, and the niece of Carl Sandburg, she has had a distinguished career as a physician and for some years was medical director of the Planned Parenthood Federation. Dr. Calderone has received awards for her work from the National Council of Women of the United States, the editors of Who's Who of American Women, and the University of Rochester. This year, Vogue magazine honored her as one of America's outstanding women.

In order that the public and the Congress may have the full story on SIECUS and Dr. Calderone, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the New York Times of September 14, and an article from Look magazine of September 9 be printed in the RECORD. Both articles detail the propaganda campaign against SIECUS and identify its source.

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

[From the New York Times, Sept. 14, 1969]

SEX EDUCATION BATTLES SPLITTING MANY COMMUNITIES ACROSS THE UNITED STATES

(By Douglas Robinson)

RACINE, WIS.—"The thing that hurt the most," said Richard B. Bliss, "was the

letters from old friends that began, 'Dear Dick, I know you don't realize you're being used by the Communists, but . . .' "

Mr. Bliss is the science consultant to the Racine Unified School District 1 and the letters were only part of a campaign of harassment in a bitter fight over sex education in the public schools.

The battle in Racine was not unusual. In recent months, cities and towns across the nation have been torn by dissension over the issue. The battles have left a residue of suspicion, mistrust and hatred on streets where good neighbors once lived.

The dispute in Racine, a medium-size city on Lake Michigan, followed a pattern now familiar in many communities. Besides the letters, there were the telephone calls.

" 'You're nothing but a dirty Communist traitor,' the anonymous callers would say, and the conversation went downhill from there," said Mr. Bliss, who considers himself a conservative.

The fight against a program about sex and family life in Racine was successful; the Board of Education voted to delay any action on the matter "until misinformation and misunderstanding are corrected."

In this area, too, Racine was not unusual, because such groups of the John Birch Society and the Christian Crusade have caused school officials and elected leaders to give way before the onslaught.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAMS

Congress and 19 state legislatures have before them measures to prohibit, control or curtail sex education in the public schools. Other legislatures have already acted.

"There are 10 states—Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Montana, North and South Dakota—that we haven't heard from yet," said Paul E. Putnam, assistant secretary for special studies of the Professional Rights and Responsibility Commission of the National Education Association. He said he assumed that those 10 "have no sex education programs planned or now functioning."

In the furor stirred up in many communities, more moderate criticism has been drowned out in the flurry of charges and counter-charges and in the wide distribution of literature that attempts to portray school officials as purveyors of filth and pornography.

LIES AND DISTORTIONS

"I've never seen a more successful propaganda campaign," Mr. Bliss said in Racine. "They used lies and distortions to try to prove their contention that sex education is a Communist plot and that such a program would undermine the morals of their children."

"The extremists were really bothered by the use of the word 'sex,' " he continued. "They were convinced we were going to teach sexual intercourse. They had no understanding of such matters as hygiene, disease prevention, care of a child, family responsibility or mature values."

"It really made no difference to them," he added. "The venereal disease and divorce rates keep rising and these people refuse to understand. It's as if they were saying, 'There's an epidemic of polio, but we're not going to let you do anything about it.' "

"Now, even after the fight, former friends are distant with me," Mr. Bliss said. "I'm sure that if my standing in the conservative community here were not so solid, I'd have more enemies."

READY-MADE CONTROVERSY

The issue of sex education in the schools has given the Birchers and their ideological counterparts a ready-made controversy that rivals disputes over religion in intensity.

Opponents of sex instruction in Minneapolis, for example, have been on the offensive for some time. They have yet to suffer a setback and there is no sex education course in the city's schools, despite a set of guidelines drawn by a group of educators three years ago.

Last week, Mrs. Elsie Zimmerman, the leader of those opposed to sex education courses in Minneapolis, said that a sex study program was "garbage."

MASTER PLAN CITED

Her supporters, Mrs. Zimmerman warned, will use "every weapon," including court injunctions, to block sex education. There is, she said, a "master plan" for a "controlled, one-world society." Her followers, mostly women, applauded warmly when she added:

"We will no longer be old ladies in tennis shoes; we will be Paul Reveres in combat boots."

Two weeks ago, Gov. Ronald Reagan of California signed a measure that prohibits school districts from requiring students to attend sex education classes. The law allows parents to keep their children from such classes if they so choose.

There is no doubt that opposition to sex education comes from a small minority. A Gallup Poll showed that 71 per cent of all adult Americans want schools to offer such courses. By unofficial estimates, about two-thirds of the nation's school districts offer sex education in some form.

COURSES BEGAN IN 1930'S

But this has been true for some time, according to Dr. Edward Mileff, consultant in health and safety education to the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation.

"This demand for sex education is merely the formal outgrowth of courses that have been in the curriculum since the mid-30's," Dr. Mileff said. "In other years, it was usually presented under such euphemisms as senior problems, marriage and family or hygiene."

The new sex education courses, which are endorsed by a preponderance of educators, church groups and medical societies, go further than previous efforts in that they are designed to teach students about themselves as sexual human beings and inform them of the sexual responsibilities of adults. In short, children are taught that sexual feelings and attitudes are not forbidden mysteries, but facets of a normal life.

"Because moral judgments are bound to creep in to such courses," Dr. Mileff said, "we have worked out these courses with parental cooperation. We try never to go beyond the needs of individual communities."

Dr. Mileff said he was not worried by the opposition to formal sex education courses and professed surprise that there has not been more hostility.

Despite the criticism, he predicted that "the overwhelming problems emerging in our urban society will mandate a responsibility for sex education."

"The crisis nature of society will create such a program," he added.

ATTACKS BEGAN IN 1968

Mr. Putnam said opposition to sex education began late last summer, when the Christian Crusade, a right-wing organization based in Oklahoma and headed by the Rev. Billy James Hargis, published a book entitled "Blackboard Power—N.E.A. Threat to America" by Dr. Gordon V. Drake. The Christian Crusade also printed another attack by the same author, a pamphlet titled "Is the Schoolhouse the Proper Place to Teach Raw Sex?"

"The sudden attacks on sex education programs took the John Birch Society unawares," Mr. Putnam said in a speech this summer. "It took one of the most vocal organizations opposing Communists in our society six months to decide that sex education is a Communist plot."

In the January, 1969, issue of the John Birch Society Bulletin, however, Robert Welch wrote that what was needed was "organized, nationwide, intensive, angry and determined opposition to the now mushrooming program of so-called sex education in the public schools."

SUBVERSIVE MONSTROSITY

"Various stages of the program," he continued, have already been imposed on some 5 to 10 per cent of the schools. Deep-laid plans have been carefully initiated to spread this subversive monstrosity over the whole American educational system, from kindergarten to high school.

"But a preponderant majority of the American people are not yet even aware of this filthy Communist plot . . ."

Birch people and other right-wing forces then sprang to the attack and MOTOREDE Committees, an ad hoc Birch Group whose name was drawn from Movement to Restore Decency, were formed in several communities.

Birchers also heeded Mr. Welch's call to organize front groups to bring the message home. Thus local groups with other names—usually acronyms such as MOMS, for Mothers Organized for Moral Stability, or POSE, for Parents Opposed to Sex Education—sprouted like mushrooms after a rain.

THE INNOCENTS DEFILED

The society also put out a $30 film strip with sound entitled "The Innocents Defiled," in which the sex education program is depicted as a plot to confront American school children with pornography.

Birch members are particularly incensed over a slide film series entitled "How Babies Are Made," produced by Creative Scope. The rights to the series were purchased by Time & Life, which also put out a book and a film strip.

"How Babies Are Made," aimed at elementary school children, frankly discusses reproduction and contains drawings of chickens and dogs mating as well as a male and female in bed with the woman lying in the man's arms. The scene of the man and woman has an aura of tenderness about it rather than sensuality.

The accompanying text for the pictures describes how sperm enters the female. Some schools and church groups use the film series, others do not.

Throughout the nation, literature that carried "horror" stories of what had happened in sex education classrooms began to appear. After checking and cross-checking, all of the stories proved false, but the damage in some communities had already been done.

For example, Mr. Bliss spent a good deal of money investigating allegations raised by rightwingers that boys and girls in a school near Racine had been instructed to go into a closet and feel one another as part of the sexual learning process. Officials and teachers in the school denied such activity.

ILLUSTRATED LECTURE

The American Education Lobby, a right-wing group based in Washington, printed a number of horror stories. Among them was one telling of a teacher in Lansing, Mich., who took off her clothes to illustrate a sex lecture. The local school board president declined to dismiss her, according to the story, saying that her activities were in the best interests of the students.

The story was checked out by Mr. Putnam at the N.E.A. He said that the incident occurred in a class for girls in home economics. The teacher was demonstrating various types of loose-fitting clothing and had changed costumes behind a screen.

"It's clear to anyone who reads the right-wing literature that they are opposed to public education by the state because they feel the state is a monolith vulnerable to Communist control," Mr. Putnam continued. "By seizing the emotional sex issue, they

automatically get a larger audience for their views."

The organization that has borne the brunt of the assault is the Sex Information and Education Council of the United States (called SIECUS and pronounced Seek-us).

SIECUS, a tax-exempt, nonprofit voluntary health organization that consults with community leaders, educators, religious groups, colleges and medical schools about sex education programs only on request, is headed by Dr. Mary S. Calderone, an authority on sex education.

The Birch Society's film strips and literature have described Dr. Calderone as the "Joan of Arc for sex education" and as a "sweet-faced, silvery-haired grandmother who shocks audiences by using four-letter words to make her point."

Although Dr. Calderone was not available to comment on the Birch attack, she has been quoted as saying that much of the material ascribed to her in right-wing publications was taken out of context.

The Birchers have also criticized Dr. Isadore Rubin, the editor of Sexology magazine and a former board member of SIECUS. Dr. Rubin is under attack because he once declined to answer Congressional investigators on possible Communist affiliations.

SIECUS has said its purpose is to "promote healthy, responsible relationships between male and female in all aspects of human behavior, not limited to the 'sex act.'"

"Education for sexuality," the organization continued, "does not attempt as its major goal to decrease veneral disease or out-of-wedlock pregnancies, but rather to help in producing more mature, responsible men and women and thus, eventually, parents who are strong and competent in their roles as spouse and parents."

"We feel that sex education is the prerogative of parents and not the schools," replied Reed A. Benson, the director of public relations for the Birch Society and its Washington representative.

BLAMES EVIL FORCES

In a recent interview, Mr. Benson said that sex education was the work of "evil forces" who were "anxious to achieve the breakdown of morality in this country."

Mr. Benson identified these forces as Communists and said that sex education in the public schools was "one more mean to break down and destroy the moral fiber of American youth."

In the cacophony of emotion over sex education, more moderate criticism has not been voiced.

"I know teachers I wouldn't want teaching math to my kids, let alone sex education," said a concerned parent in Racine.

SEEKS RESPONSIBLE CRITICS

It is this lack of more responsible questioning that has bothered such experts as Dr. Mileff, who believes that parental criticism will only make such programs stronger and better able to serve the particular needs of each community.

"Education doesn't supply the answer to living and dying, but sometimes it's the only answer," Dr. Mileff said, adding:

"No one claims that sex education programs will solve all the problems to this area of life. But how can you ignore sexuality? It's part of living."

[From Look magazine, Sept. 9, 1969]

SEX IN SCHOOL: THE BIRDS, THE BEES, AND THE BIRCHERS

Sit down with certain parents in Watkins Glen, N.Y., Hinsdale, Ill., Wichita Falls, Texas, or San Marino, Calif., and you are likely to hear much the same story. In some other city (usually quite distant), a teacher, you are told, put some very young children in a dark room and encouraged them to experiment sexually with each other. Or a child came home in a state of shock because of a brutally frank discussion of sex in his class that day. Or kindergarteners clomped to the dinner table babbling about the genital organs they'd fashioned from clay in school.

Explore further, and you will be told that these sex experiments are all part of an international Communist conspiracy to subvert America by corrupting the minds of our young. Once the youth are depraved, so the argument follows, America is on her way out. The mass media, Parent-Teacher Associations, even the American Medical Association are said to be part of this plot. But the chief conspirators are headquartered in New York City at something called SIECUS, the Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S. SIECUS, the accusers say, is the chief culprit in the drive to bring immorality into the classroom, and the teacher is its agent.

In more than 34 states across the U.S., a sometimes savage fight has erupted over what, if anything, children should be taught about sex in school, who should teach it, and what kinds of materials should be used. Telephones ring in suburban kitchens, heralding the latest lurid dispatch from the sex-in-class front, school-bond issues dangle precariously in the balance, school administrators edge gingerly through an emotional minefield, and politicians latch on to a live issue that's the hottest thing since law 'n' order.

In at least 15 state legislatures and Congress, legislation that would investigate, restrict or ban sex education in public schools is being considered. In New York, for example, state funds for and all references to sex education have been dropped from the state's two-year-old law requiring health courses in public schools (though paradoxically, New York schools are currently launching a new kindergarten to ninth-grade sex program). Louisiana's legislature has declared a moratorium on sex instruction in that state's schools, and California's Board of Education, while endorsing voluntary sex education for kindergarten through twelfth grade, has suggested no instruction in human reproduction before age nine and has labeled SIECUS materials "inappropriate" for California schools.

The sex-in-school storm blew up rather suddenly. More than half the nation's schools have some sort of sex education in their curricula, ranging from sketchy information given in a health- or physical-education course to more sophisticated "Family Living" studies that cover dating, masturbation, contraception and a wide variety of sex-related subjects. The newer courses examine morality and prevailing attitudes on sex and personal relations. Though a parent might occasionally question some aspect of a program, sex education was something most parents wanted schools to give their children. Indeed, most still do. A Gallup Poll reported in June that 71 percent of all adults questioned were in favor of sex education in the schools. Fifty-five percent favored a discussion of birth control in class (up from 46 percent, which approved such teaching in 1965), and Catholics were nearly as likely as Protestants to concur.

Why, then, the fuss? Many educators cite the John Birch Society as the key factor. The Society's January, 1969, *Bulletin* called for the establishment of "organized, nationwide, intensive, *angry* and determined opposition to the now mushrooming program of so-called sex education in the public schools." (The italics are the *Bulletin's*.) To the Birchers, the motivation behind sex instruction was clear: ". . . this whole scheme is, from beginning to end, in execution and in purpose, simply a part of the overall Communist design." Sex education, the *Bulletin* asserted, was meant to promote "universal sexual promiscuity—and perversion" and to "destroy one whole generation of American youth." The Birch Society's local Movement to Restore Decency (MOTOREDE) committees, along with the Oklahoma-based Christian Crusade, headed by the Rev. Billy James Hargis, and the American Education Lobby, another right-wing group, are the leaders in the sex-education opposition. Not all the groups contesting sex programs are Birch-connected (nor do all the Birch committees openly identify themselves as such). Local groups such as MOMS (Mothers for Moral Stability), POPE (Parents for Orthodoxy in Parochial Education) and ACRE (Associate Citizens for Responsible Education) have sprung up across the nation either to eliminate or to stop the expansion of sex instruction.

SIECUS' executive director, Dr. Mary Calderone, a 65-year-old physician, believes her five-year-old organization is merely being used as a scapegoat by the Birchers in an attempt to build mass appeal through scare tactics. SIECUS, a nonprofit organization, was started in 1964 by Dr. Calderone, formerly medical director of the National Planned Parenthood Federation, "to establish man's sexuality as a health entity." It draws its financial support principally from foundations. SIECUS acts as a consulting agency to teachers, schools, clergy, universities and community groups seeking assistance in the field of sex education. It has been widely successful in encouraging the establishment of such programs in many schools in the U.S.

Though SIECUS does not have a specific sex-education program of its own, it does publish study guides and advise schools and agencies in setting up sex programs. SIECUS' 50-man board includes physicians, clergy, educators and sex researchers. One of these, Dr. Isadore Rubin, Ph.D., is a key target in the school controversy. Rubin edits *Sexology*, a popularized sex journal whose contents include such titles as *Will Mate Swapping Solve Sex Problems?*, *Positions in Intercourse*, and *What to Do About Too-Quick Ejaculation*. The board also includes eminent figures such as Elizabeth Koontz, former head of the National Education Association and currently director of the Women's Bureau of the U.S. Labor Department; Dr. Wardell Pomeroy, one of the authors of the Kinsey Report; Dr. William Masters of the Masters-Johnson sex study; and the Rev. William H. Genné, head of the Commission on Marriage and Family Life of the National Council of Churches in the U.S.A. But Dr. Rubin and *Sexology* have drawn the wrath of the Birchers and others opposed to sex in school because he once refused to answer congressional probers on possible Communist affiliations, and because the magazine uses bold titles.

Before last year, if you'd mentioned Anaheim, Calif., most people would have thought of Disneyland, the huge amusement park that's located there. Today, Anaheim (pop. 160,000) has another kind of notoriety. From Darien, Conn., to Renton, Wash., opponents of sex education point to Anaheim as a community where, it is alleged, venereal disease and illegitimacy run rampant because of a pioneering curriculum in Family Life and Sex Education. In literature circulated by the Birch Society and Hargis' Christian Crusade, Anaheim is depicted—along with Sweden—as a swamp of juvenile immorality, Exhibit A of the results of sex education.

All that enrages and saddens craggy-faced Paul Cook, superintendent of Anaheim Union High School District and the leading figure behind what has been hailed nationally as one of the country's best school systems. It is not the Anaheim he knows.

Anaheim has had a widely acclaimed course on Family Living and Sex Education since 1965, after a survey of local parents indicated that 90 percent wanted such a course in the schools. "For the first three years, I didn't get three phone calls about

this," says Cook. "We had 99 percent participation by our students. Then, suddenly last summer—Bang! We got delegations to the board of education, people shouting imprecations in board meetings, the works." The Anaheim program, which is voluntary and covers grades seven through twelve, had come under attack by a local newspaper. One of the charges was that the course was written by SIECUS. "Actually, our course was written by a group of our own teachers before SIECUS was even a functioning organization," Cook rebuts. To confirm this, he fishes through his files to come up with a 1966 letter from SIECUS headed "Dear Superintendent," requesting information on the Anaheim course. "I feel the really big people in the Birch Society don't give a damn about sex education," says Cook, "but they realize how sensitive people are if you get right at them, and what could be closer than your kids?"

Sex and reproduction are only a part of the Anaheim approach, Superintendent Cook says. "What we have is a dialogue between the teacher and the youngster. They discuss all the problems that are of concern to youngsters, such as getting along with parents, human growth and development, dating, going steady, premarital and extramarital relationships, divorce—all the things that kids don't understand and do not have access to information about.

"Everybody is making a big to-do about morals," Superintendent Cook notes. "In a public school, you can't teach a sectarian point of view, but basically, the standards we believe in and teach would hardly be denied by any church of any denomination in our society today. We say to our kids, 'You have to have a set of standards in life. If you do this, this will be the outcome. If you do that, you'll get that outcome. Is that what you want?' We try to emphasize the practicality of moral behavior."

Nonetheless, the sex issue has boiled up in Anaheim, and in April, after a bitter campaign, two incumbents on the five-man school board were defeated by anti-sex-education candidates.

Cook believes the opponents of his program are misguided: "These people think by squashing us they are stopping their kids from getting sex information any place but in the home. But look at TV, or all the movies they are exposed to that deal with sex or sexual deviations like *The Killing of Sister George*, or *The Graduate*. If a kid has no moral guidance, what does he make out of all that?"

Across the continent, in Watkins Glen, N.Y. (pop. 3,000), the same kind of conflict is stewing. "In mid-March, our phone began to ring," says Dr. Lloyd Peak, chief administrator of Watkins Glen schools, "and perfectly respectable people began to ask, 'Are you really doing these things they say you are?' They'd heard that we'd shown a film in kindergarten that portrayed the sex organs of animals and humans during actual sexual intercourse!"

Dr. Peak says, "I called one of the people associated with the local anti-sex group and complained about these false rumors. I was told that she knew this didn't happen in Watkins Glen, that she was merely quoting from *American Opinion*, the Birch Society magazine that carried such a story in its March, 1969, issue."

In the midst of the controversy, Peak and his staff appeared before a public meeting to answer critics of the Watkins Glen program. "They talked about sex education in Oregon, in Washington, in Anaheim, California," he says, "but they never talked about Watkins Glen." Some of the critics were vitriolic. "They shouted at me, 'Shut up! Go home!'" he says, "but the district was gaining a reputation as having a horrible sex-education program, so I spoke up as strongly as I could. The punch line is that we really don't have much of a sex program. We show a slide sequence, *How Babies Are Made*, to our sixth graders and some other materials to girls in the seventh grade, but I find it hard to believe that people can get so worked up about so innocuous a program." As in Anaheim, Watkins Glen children whose parents object to the courses are excused from class, and the curriculum is overseen by an advisory committee that includes Catholic and Protestant clergymen, the local district attorney, probation officer, school principals and teachers, but the opposition has not been deflected. "I have been called a Communist and an incompetent," says Peak.

The sex course's principal opponent in Watkins Glen is Mrs. Jacqueline Rondinaro, chairman of a group called Parents Committee on Moral Education. Mrs. Rondinaro, 31, mother of six and a nurse, argues: "Sex education in itself is a good thing—everyone needs it, our whole committee agrees on that. But the manner of presentation, who should teach it, presents great problems. Basically, it is the right and responsibility of the parent. God has rules and regulations regarding sex. The parent is able to give this to his child, when the child is ready, in the context of his own religion and moral belief. I, as a Catholic, for example, would present abortion one way while somebody else who was a humanist might present it in the light of situation ethics. Or perhaps one ten-year-old is ready for this information and another might not be. The teacher can't make this judgment. The parent knows when his child is ready."

William C. Elkins, vice chairman of Mrs. Rondinaro's committee, is also head of the local Birch Society chapter. Both insist there is no connection between the two groups. Says Elkins: "I don't think we're getting the really bad stuff here in Watkins Glen that they have in Sweden or in Anaheim, California. I've read about what's being taught in Anaheim, and it's shocking!"

Elkins admits he encouraged two men to enter the Watkins Glen school-board election in July, but one of them, Daniel J. Murphy, a dairy farmer who opposes any expansion of the community's present sex program, declined to tell Look who had asked him to run. Murphy was defeated. The other Elkins-backed candidate won.

As in Anaheim, the sex dispute shattered the tranquility of Watkins Glen. "I feared we were going to lose the respect and trust of the community," says Superintendent Peak, "and that was a frightening thing. We are going to open a new high school next year, and if you lose community support, school budgets and all kinds of things suffer."

Mrs. Chris Huston, whose home-economics class for girls incorporates family life and sex instruction, explains: "It hurts the kids most of all. They're in the middle. A student may be for the program, but his parent may be against it and the teacher. I love this class, it's a fun thing. I try to relate what we're studying to the kids' own interests, their own lives, the kind of life people live in other countries and cultures. But this whole blow-up has made a few of my students suspicious of me, and that makes me a little angry. The children are the ones who are hurt because they begin to lose faith in just about everything."

A major factor in the sex-education hassle is the feeling on the part of some parents that such instruction should be framed in the context of religious precepts. "Some of us feel the discussion of human reproduction right after that of animal reproduction, for example, implies that we were both created the same way," says Mrs. Rondinaro. "While the mating process may look the same, there is the whole spiritual side involving the installation of the soul in the human that is completely ignored."

Some dissenters, including New York child psychologist Dr. Rhoda Lorand, hold to the Freudian concept the children go through a "latency period" from the age of five to about eleven, during which they normally lose any sexual curiosity and concentrate on socialization and play. The introduction of sex information at this stage could be harmful, Dr. Lorand believes. Other authorities scoff at this notion. Says Dr. Earle Marsh, of the University of California Medical Center in San Francisco, "The so-called 'latency period' is one of Freud's concepts that has pretty much been abandoned. It's just ridiculous to think that there is a period when a human being cannot be taught. In fact, the rough-and-tumble of childhood is necessary for the development of a healthy sex life. Education at any stage of a person's life makes sense, it just depends on the language you use."

Some parents who balk at sex education are afraid that talk of physical intimacy may provoke curious youngsters to experiment sexually. "It's like teaching kids to multiply before they can add," says Mrs. John F. Lundin, a Wilmette, Ill., mother of three who heads People Opposed to (Compulsory) Sex Education, or POSE. POSE is girding to contest a pilot sex program scheduled to begin in Wilmette schools this fall. Like Mrs. Rondinaro in Watkins Glen, Mrs. Lundin is "alarmed about the reports I've read about what's going on in Anaheim, California." She is also concerned about the influence of SIECUS in the Wilmette program. "We've been told unofficially by school personnel that they will not use SIECUS-related materials," she says, "but SIECUS is involved in just about all the sex materials, so we wonder."

Back in Anaheim, Superintendent Cook is incensed by the portrait of his school district being spread across the nation by the Birchers and other right-wing groups. "Look at this pamphlet called *Christianity and Sex*," he told me. "It's being circulated in Wichita Falls, Texas. It says, 'According to documented information entered in the *Congressional Record*, in Anaheim Calif., veneral disease is out of control. Homes for unwed mothers are overcrowded and a marine replied, when asked why they crowd into Anaheim on weekends: Man, everybody knows the high schools girls here are available!'"

Slamming down the pamphlet, Superintendent Cook retorts: "Every statement is a complete and utter lie! But what will people in Wichita Falls, Texas, think of the boys and girls in Anaheim Union High School District? We are all being slandered and libeled! The fact of the matter is that the latest statistics on unwed mothers in California is 9.3 per thousand. In Anaheim, it is only three per thousand, one-third the state rate. There isn't even a home for unwed mothers in Orange County!

"Statistics on venereal disease are kept on a county basis, so we don't have the figures for this district, but I'm sure that if there had been a big increase here, we'd certainly know about it."

While Cook agrees that parents and churches share a responsibility for sex education, he says, "If you ask our students, you'll discover that less than ten percent have any meaningful discussions with their parents about sex. What are the other ninety percent to do? And there isn't one church in a hundred, that I know of, that's teaching an honest course in sex instruction. The number of girls who are not even told about menstruation is shocking beyond belief! We've had girls come into our school offices in hysterics, thinking they were bleeding to death! And today, girls frequently start to menstruate in fifth grade when they are only ten years old. How can *anybody* say we shouldn't teach them about these things?"

Sex education in schools has been endorsed by the American Medical Association, the National Education Association, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the National Council of Churches, the American Public Health Association, the American Col-

lege of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, along with numerous other professional organizations. But the scurrilous literature, the wild stories and the misrepresentation circulated by the Birchers and similar groups have clearly cut into the effort of educators to mount such programs. Moreover, the sex struggle has left behind a bitter residue in communities across the nation. Says Anaheim's Superintendent Cook: "The results of all this go far beyond sex education. You don't turn off hatred just like that. It spreads and spreads. People in the community have stopped talking to each other. People come to school-board meetings now and question our textbooks on other subjects. Where will it all stop?"

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, what will be the unfinished business before the Senate when it again convenes on Monday next?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. H.R. 12781, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Chair.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate, in accordance with the previous order, stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, September 22, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 19, 1969:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ernest V. Siracusa, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bolivia.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Eugene A. Gulledge, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, vice Philip N. Brownstein, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 19, 1969:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

A. Sydney Herlong, of Florida, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1971.

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

William H. Quealy, of Virginia, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States for the unexpired term of 12 years from June 2, 1960.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Friday, September 19, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let not your heart be troubled; believe in God.—John 14: 1.

O Lord, our God, who art truth and love and who dost give Thyself to men to lead them in Thy way, grant unto us Thy spirit that we may give ourselves in service to our fellow men.

May nations and races feel their kinship with each other since we are Thy children and may we learn to work together for the good of all.

Bless those who are in need, all who are oppressed in mind and body and all who suffer. Particularly do we pray for our prisoners of war. Strengthen them and their families here at home, give them patience in suffering and a happy issue out of their affliction. May the day soon come when those now separated can be home together and enjoy their freedom in peace.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 9526. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide that employer contributions do not have to be made under that act with respect to service performed in the employ of certain public international organizations.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 193. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of a revised edition of "The Capitol," and providing for additional copies; and

H. Con. Res. 309. Concurrent resolution to print a second listing of operating Federal assistance programs compiled during the Roth study.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1471. An act to amend chapter 13 of title 38, United States Code, to increase dependency and indemnity compensation for widows and children, and for other purposes;

S. 1479. An act to amend chapter 19 of title 38, United States Code, in order to increase from $10,000 to $15,000 the amount of servicemen's group life insurance for members of the uniformed services;

S. 1650. An act to amend chapter 19 of title 38, United States Code, to provide double indemnity coverage under servicemen's group life insurance for members of the uniformed services assigned to extrahazardous duty, including duty in a combat zone;

S. 1857. An act to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation pursuant to Public Law 81-507, as amended;

S. 2003. An act to provide a special Government life insurance program for veterans of the Vietnam era;

S. 2186. An act to amend chapter 19, United States Code, so as to provide dismemberment insurance coverage under the servicemen's group life insurance program;

S. 2335. An act to authorize the District of Columbia to enter into the interstate compact on juveniles; and

S. 2546. An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON BANKRUPTCY LEGISLATION

(Mr. ROGERS of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled public hearings on the following bills:

Senate Joint Resolution 88, to create a Commission To Study the Bankruptcy Laws of the United States;

H.R. 6665, to amend the Bankruptcy Act, sections 2, 15, 17, and 38, to permit the discharge of debts in a subsequent proceeding after denial of discharge for specified reasons in an earlier proceeding to authorize courts of bankruptcy to determine the dischargeability on nondischargeability of provable debts, and to provide additional grounds for the revocation of discharges; and

H.R. 12250, to amend sections 2, 17, and 38 of the Bankruptcy Act with respect to the discharge of debts.

These hearings will begin on October 1, 1969, at 10 a.m., room 2237, Rayburn House Office Building.

Those wishing to testify or to submit statements for the record should address their requests to the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, room 2137, Rayburn House Office Building.

SCHOOL BUSING

(Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was astonished to learn from an article in the Washington Post yesterday that HEW will make no change in their past policies concerning the