Manuel Simoes Calvo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5473. A bill for the relief of Mario Mendes da Cunha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5474. A bill for the relief of Giovanna Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 5475. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Antonia Berlangieri and her daughter, Michelina Berlangieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5476. A bill for the relief of Pietro Campagnuolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5477. A bill for the relief of Ismail Elibol, Nuriya Elibol, and Fedva Elibol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5478. A bill for the relief of Ralph Gallo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5479. A bill for the relief of Nicolo Giammarresi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5480. A bill for the relief of Antonio Masucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5481. A bill for the relief of Carmen Yaciofano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF (by request):

H.R. 5482. A bill for the relief of Elena Affo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5483. A bill for the relief of Pasqualino Petringa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

42. By the SPEAKER: Petition of William T. Allen, Columbus, Ga., relative to retired pay of veterans of the armed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

43. Also, petition of the board of supervisors, Niagara County, N.Y., relative to Supreme Court appointments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

44. Also, petition of James L. Hatfield, Dallas, Tex., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE—*Wednesday, January 29, 1969*

(Legislative day of Friday, January 10, 1969)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

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

O Thou whose name is above every name, and whose sovereignty transcends all other sovereignties, make us mindful of who we are, and whom we serve, that we fail Thee not.

O Lord, put Thy law in our minds and Thy love in our hearts that we may have a good conscience, a serene spirit, a peaceful soul, a robust faith, so that this day our labor may begin, continue, and end in Thee, for the welfare of this Nation, and the advancement of Thy kingdom. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 28, 1969, be approved.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief period be allowed for the transaction of routine morning business today, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, that no disbursements have been made against the $10,000,000 appropriated for contingencies, defense, appropriation contained in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1969, through December 31, 1968; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the company for the year 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of certain banks of the Farm Credit System supervised by the Farm Credit Administration, for the fiscal year 1968, dated January 28, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION ON DISPOSAL OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on its activities in the disposal of foreign excess property, for the calendar year 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON CLAIM OF MR. CORBIE F. COCHRAN

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report and recommendation concerning the claim of Mr. Corbie F. Cochran (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON POSITIONS IN GRADES GS-16, GS-17, AND GS-18

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning positions in the U.S. General Accounting Office in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 and their incumbents (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE U.S. COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, reporting, pursuant to law, that the duties of the four GS-17 positions allocated to this agency have not changed since their last report; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the status of construction, alteration or acquisition of public buildings, dated December 31, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the National Council of the Aging, at a regional meeting held in Charleston, W. Va., praying for the provision of, in future budgets, sufficient funds to implement the administration and execution of programs designed to facilitate the involvement of the elderly poor, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 17. A bill to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 with respect to the election of the board of the Communications Satellite Corp. (Rept. No. 6).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Commerce:

Rocco C. Siciliano, of California, to be Under Secretary of Commerce; and

Capt. Joseph J. McClelland, Capt. Helmer S. Pearson, and Capt. Chester A. Richmond, Jr., U.S. Coast Guard, for promotion to the grade of rear admiral.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 746. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to include chiropractor's services among the benefits provided by the insurance program established by part B of such title; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 747. A bill for the relief of Aldo Ferretti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON (by request):

S. 748. A bill to repeal the exemption applicable to ordinary livestock in the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 749. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ralph S. Stevenson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 750. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of May 31, 1938 (48 Stat. 108), to add certain lands to the Wheeler Peak Wilderness, Carson National Forest, N. Mex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By M. SCOTT:

S. 751. A bill for the relief of Angelo Luciano Colavita, his wife, Maria Carmela Colavita, and their two sons, Michelino Colavita and Antonio Colavita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUSKIE:

S. 752. A bill to authorize the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained in certain lands heretofore conveyed to the State of Maine; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 753. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Transportation to cause the vessel *Cap'n Frank*, owned by Ernest R. Darling, of South Portland, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastwise privileges; and

S. 754. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Transportation to cause the vessel *Eugenie II*, owned by J. C. Strout, of Milbridge, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastwise privileges; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 755. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide for the temporary free importation of certain motion picture films; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 756. A bill for the relief of Teresa Lindner; and

S. 757. A bill for the relief of Yvonne Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 758. A bill to provide for the construction by the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, of a high-level bridge over Cowseagan Narrows to connect Wiscasset on the mainland with the northwestern end of the island of Westport, Maine; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 759. A bill to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Washoe Tribe of Indians certain lands in Alpine County, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 760. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 in order to provide for a fair and effective system of selecting persons for induction into the Armed Forces consistent with national security demands under such act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 761. A bill for the relief of Juan G. Parra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. PROUTY):

S. 762. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to designate the National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults as the Helen Keller Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. MONTOYA (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. DODD, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HART, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SAXBE, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 763. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to include, among other health insurance benefits covered under part B thereof, coverage of certain drugs; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 764. A bill to establish an international health, education, and labor program to provide open support for private, non-governmental activities in the fields of health, education, and labor, and other welfare fields; and

S. 765. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Lung Institute; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MCCLELLAN (for himself and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 766. A bill to amend the Act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 767. A bill for the relief of Au Kuen; and

S. 768. A bill for the relief of Au Wueng Sang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER:

S. 769. A bill to name the bridge to be constructed across the Mississippi River linking the States of Tennessee and Missouri in honor of a former member of the House, Robert A. "Fats" Everett; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 770. A bill to establish a Federal Council of Health which will have the responsibility of fixing a coherent set of national health goals for the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 771. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended, to prohibit slaughter of livestock under certain conditions which reduce the bargaining power of livestock producers generally and interfere with a free market, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 772. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain farm vehicles from the highway use tax, and to require that evidence of payment of such tax be shown on highway motor vehicles subject to tax; and

S. 773. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to exempt certain private aircraft entering or departing from the United States and Canada at night or on Sunday or a holiday from provisions requiring payment to the United States for overtime services of customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 774. A bill to authorize the mortgaging of tribal lands on the Fort Berthold Reservation for certain purposes; and

S. 775. A bill to declare that the United States shall hold certain land in trust for the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

S. 776. A bill to place in trust status certain lands on the Standing Rock Sioux Indian Reservation in North Dakota and South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 777. A bill for the relief of Sabatino Contrisciani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 750—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO ADD CERTAIN LANDS TO THE WHEELER PEAK WILDERNESS, CARSON NATIONAL FOREST, N. MEX.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 4 of the act of May 31, 1933 (48 Stat. 108), to add certain lands to the Wheeler Peak Wilderness, Carson National Forest, N. Mex., and also to protect the interests of the Taos Pueblo Indians in New Mexico.

For many years the Taos Pueblo Indians have sought to acquire title to 50,000 acres of land in the Carson National Forest in New Mexico for religious purposes. This land is all within the important Rio Pueblo and Rio Lucero Watersheds which supply water to the Taos Pueblo and to communities downstream. The residents of these communities insist that it is important that these watersheds remain in Government ownership so that the area can be protected properly and their supply of water be guaranteed. The Taos Indians insist that they must have ownership and complete control of the entire tract to protect their religion.

As far back as 1957, I introduced legislation to attempt to solve this problem. My bill would have guaranteed full protection to the Indians in their religious ceremonies and, at the same time, re-

tained the land in Government ownership to protect the rights of the non-Indian communities downstream. I introduced similar legislation again in 1959, in 1966 and in 1967. I believed my bills were fair and equitable to both sides and they would not have set a dangerous precedent by taking land out of our National Forest. The Taos Indians would not agree to any compromise and supported H.R. 3306, which proposed to transfer 48,000 acres of land to the Pueblo in trust. That bill passed the House and hearings were held in the Senate Indian Affairs Subcommittee on September 19–20, 1968, on the House bill and on S. 1624 and S. 1625 that I had introduced. Many people in New Mexico who were not in agreement with the House bill presented strong opposition to it when hearings were held in the Senate. No agreement was reached in the Senate and the legislation died at the end of the 90th Congress.

During the testimony on my 1966 bill and in conversation with the Indians, the suggestion was made that this land be included in the Wheeler Peak Wilderness. At one point the Indians agreed that this might be a good plan. This was not feasible because all of the land in the area is not of wilderness character.

The bill that I am introducing today would add approximately 4,600 acres of national forest, that qualifies for wilderness, to the Wheeler Peak Wilderness. This area would include the Blue Lake and other important religious shrines where the Taos Indians hold their annual ceremonies. Within this enlarged wilderness my proposal would set aside, for the exclusive use of the Taos Indians, 1,640 acres within the wilderness. This exclusive use area would include Blue Lake and the other major shrines.

The Secretary of Agriculture is directed to administer this portion of the Wheeler Peak Wilderness for the exclusive use of the Indians in connection with their religious ceremonials. The Department is required to remove all structures and discontinue trail maintenance within this area. The Secretary is also directed not to authorize persons who are not members of the Taos Pueblo Tribe to enter the area. However, the Secretary shall be responsible for protection of the area from fire, insects, and disease, and forest officials and law enforcement officers may enter the area if required in performance of their official duties.

Therefore, by this legislation the Indians would have an exclusive use area for their religious ceremonies and worship with a wilderness buffer zone completely surrounding it. The existing permit held by the Taos Indians on approximately 31,000 acres would be adjusted to approximately 34,500 acres.

I firmly believe that this legislation would provide for the full protection of the Indians' right to worship as they see fit; it would protect their important religious shrines and prevent any interference with their secret ceremonies. I feel they should have this protection, and I want to make sure that it is guaranteed. At the same time, there is an obligation to protect the water supply from this area and the rights of those communities downstream. I am hopeful that this bill will be the basis for a final agreement and settlement of this problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire text of the bill printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 750) to amend section 4 of the act of May 31, 1933 (48 Stat. 108), to add certain lands to the Wheeler Peak Wilderness, Carson National Forest, N. Mex., and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 750

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) for the purposes of safeguarding the interests and welfare of the tribe of Indians known as the Pueblo de Taos of New Mexico, the following described lands are hereby designated for addition to and as a part of the Wheeler Peak Wilderness, Carson National Forest, New Mexico:

Beginning at a point on Old Mike Peak on the southeast boundary of the Wheeler Peak Wilderness; thence easterly along the crest of the ridge dividing Red River from the Rio Pueblo de Taos to its interception with the west boundary of the Beaubien and Miranda Grant (Maxwell Grant); thence southeasterly along the west boundary of the aforesaid Grant to the crest of the ridge between the Bonita Park drainage and the Rio Pueblo de Taos; thence southward along the crest of the aforesaid ridge to the junction of the Witt Park drainage and the Rio Pueblo de Taos; thence northwesterly along the crest of the ridge forming the south boundary of the Waterbird Lake drainage to its interception with the crest of the ridge between the Rio Lucero and the Rio Pueblo de Taos; thence northerly along the crest of the aforesaid ridge to the point of beginning of Old Mike Peak, containing approximately 4,600 acres, more or less.

(b) Subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of this Section, the area added to the Wheeler Peak Wilderness by this Act shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as Wilderness.

(c) The following described portion of the Wheeler Peak Wilderness as enlarged by this Act, containing approximately 1,640 acres, more or less, is hereby segregated for the exclusive use of the Pueblo:

Beginning at a point where National Forest System Trail No. 90 intercepts the crest of the ridge between the Rio Lucero and the Rio Pueblo de Taos south of Old Mike Peak; thence easterly along Trail No. 90 to a point approximately 0.1 mile south of Red Dome; thence southeasterly to an unnamed lake approximately 0.5 mile southeast of Red Dome; thence southerly along the drain from the aforesaid lake to its junction with the Rio Pueblo de Taos; thence southeasterly along the Rio Pueblo de Taos to the nose of the ridge forming the south boundary of the Star Lake drainage; thence westerly along the crest of the aforesaid ridge to its interception with the crest of the ridge between the Rio Lucero and Rio Pueblo de Taos; thence northerly along the crest of the aforesaid ridge to its interception with the National Forest System Trail No. 50; thence northerly along aforesaid Trail No. 50 to its departure to the west from aforesaid ridge; thence northerly along the crest of the aforesaid ridge to its interception with National Forest System Trail No. 90 and the point of beginning.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall (1) administer this portion of the Wheeler Peak Wilderness for the exclusive use of the Pueblo de Taos Indians in connection with their religious ceremonials; (2) remove all structures from the portion and discontinue trail maintenance therein; (3) not authorize persons who are not members of the Pueblo de Taos Tribe to enter the described portion: *Provided,* That the Secretary shall continue to be responsible for protection of the area from fire, insects, and disease, and employees of the Forest Service may enter the area for these purposes: *Provided further,* That law enforcement officers may enter the area in performance of official duties.

SEC. 2. Section 4 of the Act of May 31, 1933 (48 Stat. 108), providing for the protection of the watershed within the Carson National Forest for the Pueblo de Taos Indians in New Mexico, is hereby amended by amending the description of the area referred to in that section to read as follows:

Beginning at the northeast corner of the Taos Pueblo Grant; thence west along north boundary of aforesaid Grant to its interception with the southeast corner of the Tenorio Tract; thence northwesterly and northeasterly along the east boundary of the Tenorio Tract to the point where it intersects the boundary of the Lucero de Godoi or Antonio Martinez Grant; thence following the boundary of the Lucero de Godoi Grant northeasterly, southeasterly and northerly to Station 76 on the east boundary of the survey of the Lucero de Godoi Grant according to the March 1894 survey by United States Deputy Surveyor John H. Walker as approved by the United States Surveyor's Office, Santa Fe, New Mexico, on November 23, 1894; thence east .85 mile along the south boundary of the Wheeler Peak Wilderness according to the description dated July 1, 1965, and reoprted to Congress pursuant to section 3(a)(1) of the Wilderness Act (78 Stat. 891) to intersection with the crest of the ridge between the Rio Lucero and the Rio Pueblo de Taos; thence southerly along aforesaid crest to its interception with the ridge forming the south boundary of Waterbird Lake drainage; thence southeasterly along aforesaid ridge to junction of Witt Park drain and the Rio Pueblo de Taos; thence easterly along the Witt Park drain to a point ½ mile from the Rio Pueblo de Taos; thence southwesterly along a line ½ mile east of the Rio Pueblo de Taos and parallel to it to the northeast corner of Sec. 1, T. 25 N., R. 14 E.; thence southward along the township line to the east quarter corner of Sec. 13, T. 25 N., R. 14 E., on crest of ridge dividing the Rio Pueblo de Taos from the Rio Fernando de Taos; thence westerly along aforesaid ridge to its interception with the east boundary of the Taos Pueblo Grant; thence northerly to the point of beginning containing approximately 34,500 acres, more or less.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to amend the permit granted to the Pueblo de Taos Indians pursuant to section 4 of the Act of May 31, 1933 (48 Stat. 108), to provide that:

(a) The description of the area under permit to the Pueblo de Taos shall conform with the description of the area described in section 2 of this Act.

(b) The Secretary shall make timber, forage, and wood available without charge in the entire permit area as amended by this Act for personal or Tribal community needs of the members of the Pueblo or the Pueblo community in such manner that does not impair the watershed.

(c) Through extension and improvement of the forest and other vegetative cover in the permit area the Secretary shall manage the

area in accordance with accepted watershed management principles so as to provide optimum quantities and quality of water from the area for the benefit of the Pueblo de Taos Indians and others dependent on the Rio Pueblo de Taos and Rio Lucero for water.

(d) Other provisions of the existing permit shall apply to the entire permit area as amended by this Act.

SEC. 4. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value to the Pueblo de Taos of the provisions of this Act as well as the value of the Carson National Forest permit pursuant to section 4 of the Act of May 31, 1933 (48 Stat. 108), should be credited to the United States or should be set off against any claim of the Pueblo de Taos against the United States.

S. 759—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO DECLARE THAT THE UNITED STATES HOLDS IN TRUST FOR THE WASHOE INDIAN TRIBE CERTAIN LANDS IN ALPINE COUNTY, CALIF.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Washoe Indian Tribe certain lands in Alpine County, Calif.

This legislation, Mr. President, is identical to the bill (S. 2257) I introduced in the 90th Congress. Its enactment was delayed by several last-minute questions of a technical nature. I reintroduce it now so that Congress may complete action on what I consider to be an overdue and meritorious proposal to guarantee this Indian tribe orderly community development of its reservation.

The land involved embraces some 80 acres of Federal domain adjacent to the Washoe Indian Reservation in Nevada. As I have stated, the land is badly needed for orderly community development. Specifically, it will provide a land base for an Indian housing development.

There were some preliminary problems in reaching agreement on the site that is outlined in my bill, but no question on the merits of the plan. The Washoe Tribe can certainly lay prior claim to the area in advance of State and county jurisdiction and is entitled to it.

While some technical questions were raised in committee consideration of the legislation last session, I believe it is accurate to say the bill has full Interior Department support. If some problems remained from the California side, it is my understanding that they have been worked out and that it is felt Indian rights to this land should be protected in line with the bill I introduce today.

It is my hope that action can be completed on this legislation as early as possible, and I would hope the concerned committees of both Houses can expedite action on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 759) to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Washoe Tribe of Indians certain lands in Alpine County, Calif., introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 760—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO REFORM THE DRAFT

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate's Armed Services Committee, I took part during the spring of 1967 in hearings which eventually evolved into the Selective Service Act of 1967. That act was a step in the right direction, but it did not go as far as I would like to have seen it go and mainly for one specific reason: We had been led to believe by the administration that it would make certain reforms if we left them enough flexibility in the new law. Knowing that the President and the National Security Council are the only ones who have enough information available at all times to make immediate decisions that are necessary to make certain that our country has an adequately staffed military force. I agreed to this flexibility. However, the reforms that I had been led to believe would be accomplished by the administration have been left undone.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am introducing a measure which would correct the more glaring problems that still form part of our national draft law. This measure is similar to the one which I introduced in June of last year. It was vital at that time; it is urgent now.

Perhaps the most distressing trouble with the draft, a trouble which was called repeatedly to my attention during the hearings on the draft bill, is the years and years of uncertainty it imposes on young men, particularly students, who cannot make any plans to continue their education or get a job with any certainty until at least after age 26. I would like to quote, Mr. President, from the Senate Armed Services Committee report on the subject:

> The sequence under which eligible persons are inducted for military service today appears elsewhere in this report. This sequence is determined administratively under the President's power to implement the law by regulations. After delinquents and volunteers for induction, persons between the ages of 19 and 26 are reached, with the oldest to be selected first.
>
> This sequence of induction has been criticized almost unanimously by the persons who have reviewed the operations of the draft law and its administration. Among the reasons for the criticism of the sequence are: (1) it prolongs a period of uncertainty about whether a person will be inducted; (2) it causes hardships for employers when trained employees are drafted; (3) it increases the number of deferment applications and appeals that must be considered; and (4) it provides older manpower for the Armed Forces than would another system.
>
> In his selective service message to the Congress the President has indicated his intention to issue an Executive order that would change the present sequence of induction by having the primary vulnerability to the draft exist for persons between the ages of 19 and 20.
>
> The Committee is not opposed to reversing the current sequence of induction. The transition in reversing the sequence of induction presents some problems, however. If all those persons over the age of 20 at the time the transition is accomplished are not to receive an unfair advantage as a result of the transition, they should be subjected to the same vulnerability as the 19-year-old class. Even if those over 20 are considered along with the 19-year-olds, the number of persons over 20 is likely to be greater than the number between the ages of 19 and 20.
>
> Thus a preponderance of eligibles who are over 20 would tend to defeat the objective of selecting the 19-year-olds. Moreover, those older than 20 would have the advantage of a reduced vulnerability to the draft, even if they are considered on the same basis as the 19-year-olds. Many of those who would receive this advantage have been deferred as students or for occupational reasons.

That is the way the matter stood in the spring of 1967; unfortunately we are still in the same position today. After these months of delay, I feel compelled to act to try and correct these glaring problems with the present selective service law. I regret that the 1967 act did not correct this problem; I know that thousands of American young men regret it. Now we must act to correct our error.

Basically my measure is a tightly drawn bill that would reverse the existing order of draft call so that induction and selection will be made primarily from 19-year-olds, instead of taking the oldest first from 25 on down, as is now practiced. The bill creates a primary selection group of time-limited vulnerability from which most draftees would come in the future. This primary selection group consists of first, men between the ages of 19 and 20 who are not deferred or exempted; second, men between the ages of 19 and 35 who on the date of the enactment of this bill were deferred but become no longer deferred; and, third, men between the ages of 20 and 26 when this bill is enacted who are neither deferred or exempted.

Everyone who testified before the Senate committee supported this age-reversal solution to many of the draft's uncertainties. Under it each young man normally would undergo 1 year of prime draft vulnerability. If he were not inducted during that year he would be free to plan his future with virtual certainty that short of all-out war he would not be needed in the armed services. Students would be deferred for undergraduate work and would, when those deferments ended, undergo their year of prime vulnerability.

Since both 19-year-olds and new college graduates would combine to make up the primary selection group in any given year there would be no danger, such as we face this year, of having all of the year's demand fall on college graduates thus stripping the graduate schools of scholars at one fell swoop.

Thus, my bill would end lengthy uncertainty and graduate-school stripping. It would provide a better, fairer, more sensible selective service system.

I urge my colleagues to give it serious consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 760) to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 in order to provide for a fair and effective system of selecting persons for induction into the Armed Forces consistent with national security demands under such act, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 762—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO DESIGNATE THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR DEAF-BLIND YOUTHS AND ADULTS AS THE HELEN KELLER CENTER FOR DEAF-BLIND YOUTHS AND ADULTS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I introduce on behalf of myself and Senators DOMINICK, JAVITS, and PROUTY, a bill which would amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to designate the National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults as the Helen-Keller Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults.

My Senate colleagues will recall that in 1967, after too many years of neglect, Congress finally turned its attention to the serious problems facing deaf-blind citizens, who, although small in numbers, are so great in need. As a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Health, I helped to initiate and strongly supported this effort.

As part of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1967 (Public Law 90-99), Congress authorized funds and other assistance to establish a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults.

The Center will provide community organization services, including a field service to assist States and communities in gaining a better understanding of the potentialities of deaf-blind persons, helping in case-finding, assisting families and local communities to participate in the rehabilitation process, and resettling the deaf-blind after services. The Center will also include prerehabilitation services to prepare the deaf-blind for the intensive experience they will undergo once the full rehabilitation gets underway. The major task of the Center, of course, will be the program of rehabilitation services, including orientation, residence services, casework and counseling, medical and allied services, evaluation in all areas, job training, continued language and communication instruction, recreational activities, resettlement, and long-range followup.

The Center has a tremendous task before it, and I am certain that it will accomplish great things. I can think of no more fitting and appropriate first step than to make this Center a living memorial to Helen Keller and her spirit and courage.

Mark Twain, shortly before his death, remarked:

> The most interesting characters of the nineteenth century were Napoleon and Helen Keller.

Helen Keller went on to become one of the most interesting characters of the 20th century, as well. Her life, which came to an end this past June, was not only interesting, but, perhaps more importantly, was also one of the most inspiring of this, or any, age. Deaf and blind as the result of a disease of infancy, she went on to live a rich and full life, an inspiration to millions in this country and throughout the world. Her remarkable story became known to all, as a result of her own writings and, in recent years, through the wonderful play and movie, "The Miracle Worker."

Helen Keller's life was remarkable, yet there are several thousands of other Americans with similar afflictions, for whom not enough has been done to give them the same opportunities she had. There are at present about 5,000 deaf-blind youth and adults in the United States, and in California alone there are over 200 deaf-blind persons. These individuals, described by Helen Keller as "the most isolated and loneliest group of people in our society," have long represented one of the most formidable problems in rehabilitation. The true capabilities of large number of deaf-blind people have never been determined, simply because they have been such a neglected group. The work for the deaf-blind that has been done has made quite clear that the rehabilitation process is long and quite different in many ways from that of other handicapped persons.

So, Mr. President, I think it most appropriate that the Center be named after Helen Keller, whose life symbolized so much courage and indomitability for mankind in general and for those afflicted with the twin disabilities of deafness and blindness in particular. Helen Keller's life was devoted to initiating a new era of work for the blind of the world. Her dream was "that every blind child have an opportunity to receive an education, and every blind adult, a chance for training and useful employment." It is altogether fitting that this new Center, which will go a long way toward making that dream reality, should be named for that remarkable woman.

In the coming year, Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Health, I intend to follow closely the progress and activities of the Helen Keller Center and to see to it that after it is renamed, the Center will in fact be a living memorial to Helen Keller and a lasting inspiration to those it is designed to serve.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 762) to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to designate the National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults as the Helen Keller Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults, introduced by Mr. MURPHY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 763—INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO INCLUDE THE COSTS OF OUTPATIENT DRUGS UNDER MEDICARE

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, on January 15 I announced my intention to again sponsor legislation aimed at providing some degree of protection for older people against the catastrophic costs of prescription drugs which some of them must bear every year. Today I am introducing such a proposal which, I believe, can best afford this much needed insurance assistance to millions of older people.

This measure is being offered on behalf of myself and Senators ANDERSON, BROOKE, BYRD of West Virginia, CHURCH, DODD, EAGLETON, EASTLAND, FULBRIGHT, HART, INOUYE, JACKSON, JAVITS, KENNEDY, LONG of Louisiana, MAGNUSON, MCGEE, MCGOVERN, MCINTYRE, METCALF, MONDALE, MOSS, MUSKIE, PASTORE, PELL, RANDOLPH, RIBICOFF, SAXBE, STEVENS, TYDINGS, and YARBOROUGH.

I have delayed introducing this legislation up to now, in order to have time to study some of the findings and recommendations of the Task Force on Prescription Drugs. As the Senators know, this task force was established by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare after Congress directed the Secretary of the Department to undertake a complete examination of the issues likely to arise in connection with a drug benefit program under medicare. The task force has recently published its findings on a wide range of subjects relating to the development, distribution, sale, and costs of prescription pharmaceuticals in the United States, and it is now time for the Congress to weigh what these findings mean in terms of legislative action.

Most of us in the Senate, of course, are already familiar with proposals to extend the coverage of medicare to include the costs of outpatient drugs required by the many beneficiaries of the medicare legislation. Even before medicare passed the Senate, several of our colleagues had pointed out the gaps in the protection created by the omission of an outpatient drug benefit in either the hospital or supplementary medical insurance portions of the program. Since 1965, several Members and committees of the Senate have given considerable attention to the drug needs of older Americans and have worked to enact a program which would close this important gap in medicare coverage. In fact, in 1966, the Senate passed such a program, but we were unable to persuade the House to agree with the proposal. In 1967, a program which I sponsored along with approximately one-third of the Senators was nearly adopted again, although the best we could achieve was a directive to the executive branch asking for a review of the issues and problems. The reports and background papers of the Task Force on Prescription Drugs have now been completed and there can no longer be any reason for legislative delay in this matter.

What the task force has found about the drug needs of the elderly has long been well known, particularly to those older Americans who depend upon large quantities of expensive medications to remain ambulatory and productive in their later years. In its third interim report, the task force observed:[1]

> Since the advent of medicare, prescription drugs have represented the largest single personal health expenditure that the aged must meet almost entirely from their own resources—some 20 percent of their personal health expenditures. Although the elderly represent less than 10 percent of the population, they account for nearly 25 percent of all prescription drug costs, and their annual per capita expenditure for drugs is more than three times that of persons under age 65.

The impact of these expenditures on the elderly, of course, takes on real significance when viewed in terms of the

[1] "Coverage of Drugs Under Medicare," *Task Force on Prescription Drugs—Third Interim Report;* December 31, 1968.

limited resources available to the elderly to meet such costs and the inadequacy of existing protection against such expenditures provided under private insurance arrangements.

The ability of the elderly to meet the costs of prescription medications is directly related to their income position which, as everyone knows, is certainly meager indeed. In 1966, for example, half of the families headed by an individual aged 65 or more had incomes of less than $3,645. For elderly men and women living alone, or with someone not a relative, more than half had incomes of less than $1,500. By way of contrast, the median income for all Americans aged 14 or more in that year was $7,436 for families and $2,270 for unrelated individuals. As inconceivable as it may seem, 11 percent of the elderly families and 53 percent of the elderly individuals in this country received less than $30 a week, while 30 percent of the older families and 29 percent of the older individuals had incomes between $30 to $60 a week. These are the total resources with which food, shelter, clothing, and the other necessities must be met. The impact of large drug expenditures on these resources—needless to say—can indeed be catastrophic. Anyone who has studied the volume of background papers, prepared by the Task Force, entitled "The Drug Users," can at once recognize the severe impact of the costs of medication on older Americans.

If the total drug burden of the elderly were spread across the entire aged population, the expenses would be substantial for each older individual. Tragically, however, this burden is unequally carried. Seven years ago, the National Center for Health Statistics reported that 35 percent of those persons 65 or more had annual drug expenses of $50 or more, and 18 percent had expenses amount to over $100 annually, and this was 7 years ago. These statistics cannot reveal the utter despair of those who perhaps manage along on carefully controlled budgets, but are suddenly confronted with such overwhelming expenditures for prescription drugs. These percentages which can be rattled off so casually tell us little of the individual human tragedy. I am convinced that something simply must be done.

Can it be said that expanding medicare to cover outpatient drugs is unwarranted because private insurance arrangements are providing adequate protection which the older person needs? The answer is an emphatic "no." The task force reported that only 34 percent of the entire civilian population of all ages had some form of coverage against the costs of prescription drugs provided on an outpatient basis under private insurance arrangements in 1966. Of this number, only 9 percent—approximately 1.7 million older persons—had any kind of protection whatsoever. More significant, however, is the fact that private insurance, in total, met only 2.8 percent of all medical care expenditures other than that for hospital care and physicians' services. The total proportion of drug costs met by private insurance must, therefore, be exceedingly small.

In short, Mr. President, older Americans have neither the resources, nor the insurance protection, to adequately deal with sudden or chronic prescription drug requirements of large proportions. According to the task force, older people in America receive about 9 percent of their prescription drugs free—either from a physician or through a welfare program. Another 8 percent of their drug costs are reduced by tax savings, while an estimated 2 percent—I repeat, 2 percent—are recovered by insurance. In other words, about 80 percent of the expenditures must come from the pockets of the elderly themselves. The result, of course, is that an older American must meet markedly higher drug expenses with markedly lower incomes and resources. The task force reached the conclusion which I think anyone who has studied the material must reach:

> We find, therefore, that there is a need for an out-of-hospital drug insurance program under medicare.

It seems to me that if there is no longer at issue the question of need, then the issue is now what program can best provide the protection the elderly need within the context of the present medicare law? To this question, there are a number of answers, some of which are discussed in the task force's report, others which are not.

I share the task force's view that "initially, at least, an attempt cannot be made to provide comprehensive drug coverage—that is, coverage of all prescription drugs for all the elderly." Not only is such a proposal expensive, as the task force points out, it is, as far as I am concerned, inconsistent with the principles of a modest drug insurance program. For many older people, drug expenses are sufficiently small that they are within manageable limits; many persons, in fact, in any given year may have no prescription drug expense at all. Funds for such a program should be concentrated to help only those who incur a substantial economic risk over the insurable period—in other words, for persons who are confronted with inordinately large expenses for medications during the year.

Although the task force and I agree that any program to cover the costs of drugs must, at the outset, be modest in scope, I am afraid that at this time I cannot agree with all of the other recommendations made by the task force, about the design of a drug benefit program.

The bill which I am introducing today, for myself and on behalf of 30 other Senators, is drafted along the lines of S. 2936, which I sponsored in February of 1968. The program outlined in the bill represents a modest and rational approach toward providing drug coverage under medicare for those who really need protection. There are a number of principles on which this program is based.

First. The program is designed to pay benefits only to those who have demonstrably incurred a significant financial burden as a result of substantial requirements for prescription medicines.

Second. The bill in no way alters the existing pharmaceutical arrangements across the land by imposing upon a community pharmacy the requirement that they become vendors for the Government. No effort is made to require pharmacies to accept this or that Federal payment for prescriptions filled for medicare beneficiaries. No new administrative burdens or elaborate recordkeeping procedures are imposed upon the small businessmen who have, until now, served communities with oustanding pharmaceutical services.

Third. The bill subscribes to the belief that physicians must ultimately determine the appropriate drug for individual patients. Physicians can be assured that their patients will receive the product they prescribe just as they now can, and the relationships between medicine and pharmacy are not changed as a result of this program. Finally, the bill links program liability to a reimbursement mechanism associated with a formulary system, the purpose of which is to pay for benefits in a rational and economical way.

Specifically, the bill establishes a program in which each social security beneficiary, who has elected to enroll in the Part B program of medicare, become entitled to benefits toward certain expenses he incurs for prescription drugs which he purchases as an outpatient. Before receiving payments, persons covered by the program would have to satisfy a drug deductible of $25 annually on the basis of charges paid for any drugs which require lawful prescription. The purpose of the deductible is to concentrate the income of the program for benefits for those who are confronted with drug expenses of a substantial nature. Congress may find that the actual amount of such a deductible should be more or less than $25, but I believe some kind of initial, or corridor deductible, is—at least at the outset—a desirable feature of the program. Programs which begin paying benefits from the first prescription in any one year—even where the patient must meet a fixed prescription charge—tends to weaken the ability of a drug program to meet inordinately large expenses, since some of the program's income goes to pay benefits for those whose total annual expenses may well be within manageable limits.

The amount of benefits payable to the beneficiary, who has satisfied the deductible, would be based upon a schedule of allowances prepared by a formulary committee. Actual reimbursement would be equal to the lesser of the allowance for the drug, as provided for in the formulary, or 80 percent of the actual charge for the drug by the community pharmacist; any difference between the actual charge and the allowance would be borne by the beneficiary.

The principal purpose of the formulary feature contained in the bill is to identify drugs which can be used as a basis for reimbursement under the program. The use of a formulary can introduce some degree of rationality into an otherwise rather confused world of multiple products and the proliferation of names. Between 1950 and 1959, for example, a total of 4,667 new prescription drug products were introduced in the United States, but

only 337 of these were new single chemical entities. The others were combination drugs or duplications of existing products. Between 1957 and 1968, the number of new products totaled 2,131, of which only 311 were new single chemical entities. The development of a formulary, depending upon its particular makeup, can do much to base reimbursement determinations on a reasonable pharmaceutical basis. Since all drugs cannot be covered, decisions should be made to exclude from such a formulary over-the-counter drugs which are prescribed, but which do not require such prescription, certain combination products which in combination are not demonstrably more effective than their constituent active ingredients, duplicative products, or noncritical medications. There are provisions in the bill which permit wide room for professional latitude in arriving at which drugs should be included for purposes of reimbursement.

But I emphasize that the formulary mechanism in the bill does not place restrictions upon the physician insofar as his prescribing practices are concerned, nor does it authorize pharmacists to fill prescriptions with any product other than that specified by the physicians. The formulary mechanism in the bill only restricts the Government from paying for products not included in the formulary. In no way, is a patient prohibited from receiving the drug his physicians wants him to receive.

The formulary system in this bill aids in establishing the amount of benefits to which a beneficiary is entitled for drugs covered under the program. The formulary committee, with the aid of professional counsel, should be able to survey the availability and costs of particular drug products, each having the same active ingredients, for the purpose of ascertaining the costs of the least expensive product of acceptable quality. This cost, together with the costs of dispensing such a drug, would become the amount of benefit to which a beneficiary is entitled for a covered drug—except, of course, where 80 percent of the actual charge made for such drug is a lesser amount.

According to the task force report, the drug quality studies now being carried out by the Food and Drug Administration will be completed by 1971, thereby making possible assurances of uniform drug quality. This will greatly facilitate determinations by the committee as to which products shall serve as the basis for benefit determinations. The task force has stated that it is feasible to limit Federal expenditures for drugs to those specified by the Secretary, with the expert advice of the medical community.

As in the past, there will be made, no doubt, charges against this program that it interferes with the right of the physician to prescribe for his patients as he sees fit or that the program will tie the hands of pharmacists to payments determined by the Federal Government. A careful examination of the bill, however, will show that these charges are unfounded.

However, in the light of the urgent need to find a solution to the problem of drug costs for the aged, I call upon the critics of this program to support efforts to bring these issues to hearings, in order that problems can be ironed out. Several groups in the past have hesitated to support any kind of a program, until additional information was available. America's pharmaceutical manufacturers, for example, told the Senate Committee on Finance late in 1967:

> The PMA does not oppose reimbursement for drugs to title XVIII non-hospitalized beneficiaries, but urges, because of the current HEW study on the subject and in light of other proposed changes in the Social Security Act, affecting both benefits and tax rates, that the expansion of Medicare benefits as proposed by S. 17 not be adopted at this time.

S. 17 was the bill which I introduced to establish a drug benefit under part B of medicare in the first session of the 90th Congress. Now that HEW has completed its study, and has recommended a program which incorporates many of the ideas contained in this new bill, I hope the manufacturers will join with me in working toward arriving at an equitable and responsible program.

Professional pharmacy has, on several occasions in the past, endorsed most of the concepts contained in earlier drug programs which have come before the Senate, and I expect that, after reviewing the task force report, they will again be prepared to offer Congress their professional counsel in drafting a workable outpatient drug program.

The views of older people on the need for a drug program are well known. They have a right to expect that the Senate will move to bring about changes in the present medicare program which will at least provide some measure of protection against catastrophic outpatient drug expenses.

The task force and the former Secretary of the Department have said that it is feasible to provide for a program of drug coverage under either portion of the medicare program. They recommend a program financed under the payroll tax program of part A, for reasons outlined in the report, and, I presume, because of their urging that the financing for the entire part B program be shifted to the payroll tax system. Financing considerations are exceedingly complex, and I do not propose to examine them here, except to say that I have serious reservations about transferring the cost of the supplementary insurance program to a prepaid taxable payroll basis at this time.

The task force recommends a program, which aside from its financing provisions, is substantially different from that proposed in this bill. Their proposal would involve the creation of a vendor program in which pharmacies across the country would take on a major role in the administration of benefits. Until I would have an opportunity to hear the views of the businessmen and pharmacists who would be involved in such an extensive vendor arrangement, I am reluctant to support a vendor program. Community pharmacies are generally small businesses which may not have the resources and time to assume the enormous recordkeeping and other duties proposed in the task force report on behalf of over 18 million older persons. The fact that there are some 52,265 independent and chain pharmaceutical outlets in the United States would, in my judgment, raise serious administrative problems and costs for such a program. Nevertheless, I have an open mind on the issue of a vendor versus nonvendor program, and am prepared to examine carefully the suggestions of those who would be involved as to the best way of beginning a program.

I am deeply concerned about the manner in which the task force suggests that outpatient drugs should be covered at the outset of a program. As I understand the recommendations, the task force argues that the only drugs which should be covered are associated with chronic disease conditions, such as diabetes, cardiovascular, respiratory, kidney diseases, and perhaps other categories. I, for one, am not convinced that this approach to drug coverage is very desirable. Why should the test of a particular drug's inclusion in the program be its association with long-term drug therapy, rather than upon the economic impact of prescription drugs generally upon the resources of an older person. There is, of course, some relationship between chronic conditions and drug requirements, and hence between chronic conditions and drug expenses. But it seems to me that financial burden should determine the point at which benefits are paid.

The task force recommends that once a drug is designated for inclusion in the program, payments would be made regardless of the condition for which it is prescribed, presumably even if it is used for short-term therapy. I wonder whether this approach might result in the substitution, insofar as possible, of covered drugs for those which are not covered. This is something which Congress would have to examine closely to determine whether medicine considers such a method to be in the best interests of prescribing practice, and whether such an approach is the most efficient, economical, and rational approach toward providing coverage for outpatient drugs. I, for one, would be hard pressed to explain to an older person with $200 of drug expenses, half of which went for drugs covered by the long-term therapy criterion, and half which were not, that only 50 percent of expenses were subject to reimbursement, while another beneficiary with $35 of drug expense, all for chronic therapy drugs covered in the program, would be entitled to some degree of protection against his entire bill. I am not at all certain this approach would achieve the objective of providing coverage to those who are most in need of it.

There are a great many things in the task force report which I feel need analysis and about which I hope to offer some comments at a later date. I am, for example, very disappointed in the fact that the task force provided a cost estimate broken down by its elements for my amendment 440 to the Social Security Amendments of 1967—which from the standpoint of cost no longer resembles the program I proposed in 1968, or in-

tend to introduce at this time. An estimate for my 1968 proposal was hastily added to the report only after I reviewed the preliminary documents and discovered that the task force had not even included such an estimate. For the second time in less than a year, I have been unable to obtain the cooperation of the Government actuaries in reviewing those elements in my proposals which would have a bearing on the costs of such programs. In making a cost estimate for S. 2936, which I introduced last year, social security actuaries have indicated in the report a per capita benefit cost of $38.47, which, according to the other statements in the report, results from the fact that "its cost closely approximates that of the proposals of the type considered in this report with a $25 initial deductible and 20-percent coinsurance." Yet no weight is given for the reduction in liability resulting from the fact that payments would be based, in part, on the cost of the least expensive drug product where alternative products are available, nor is any weight given to the fact that the formulary contained in the 1968 proposal would automatically result in a cost reduction due to the fact that not all drug products would be included in it. In fact, the Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration himself, in a memorandum to me of March 26, 1968, noted "that your bill would have a lower cost because of the provision for a formulary."

The task force's own report on the drug users indicates that a reduction of 6.1 percent in the costs of drugs listed in the Master Drug List in 1966 would have resulted had generic prices been used—and providing that the pharmacists received the same gross profit in that year. And included in that list are many duplicative drugs, compounds, and other products which would probably not serve as the basis for reimbursement under the formulary mechanism envisioned in S. 2936. I am utterly astonished that those who worked on the estimates had such little appreciation for the impact of a formulary on the issue of costs. The task force estimate of cost for S. 2936 observes that "this amendment has a slightly higher cost because of containing a carryover deductible provision, but has offsetting lower costs for certain other reasons." At least in the minds of the actuaries, these factors seem to balance each other out. However, according to the actuaries own estimate of amendment 440, the carryover deductible provision resulted in an additional cost per capita of 50 cents per year. I really wonder if the actuaries feel that the combined effects of generic-based liability and the operation of a formulary would have such minimal effect. If so, I suggest that they return to other portions of their report to reexamine the estimate of savings resulting from implementation of the drug bill proposed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, and reexamine the effects of formularies used in some of the State public assistance programs about which they speak.

This time, I intend to ask the Chief Actuary for a complete and detailed estimate of the costs associated with the program I am now sponsoring, and I hope that a fair appraisal can be given to the proposal. I cannot, of course, bring to bear the expertise which the Chief Actuary and his large staff have available to them, but I do believe that the bill deserves an assessment based upon what is actually contained in it. Since, in the new proposal, I have eliminated the carryover deductible provision, I expect to see just what cost factor is attributed to pricing based on generic alternatives and the use of a rational drug formulary. I can assure the Senators that a full review of the bill and its cost will be undertaken and made available for their review.

Mr. President, from these remarks it should be obvious that there is an urgent need for Congress to assess the reports of the Task Force on Prescription Drugs, to weigh various proposals, and to provide a forum for a discussion of the complex issues involved in the design of a drug benefit program. Some things are however already very clear. First, that there is a need for some kind of program is demonstrably evident; the elderly need our help. Second, there are a number of ongoing drug programs in the United States which offer the Congress an opportunity to draft a program which is workable, meaningful, and within the limits of manageability. The task force reports need additional analysis and review, but not in a way that such a review and assessment delays further congressional action already long overdue. The place for this review is in hearings before the Congress, and I implore the Members of this body to support this effort to arrive at a resolution of the problem of drug costs for the elderly as quickly as possible. In the weeks to come, I intend to study further the findings of the reports, to meet with interested groups and organizations in the hope that the best possible program can be prepared for deliberation before this body. The Montoya bill may not be the final answer to the problem, but we now have the information we need to find the solution. The older people of America are entitled to an answer from the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, I send to the Chair this legislation and ask that it be referred to the proper committee. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the text of my bill.

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

The bill (S. 763) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to include, among the health insurance benefits covered under part B thereof, coverage of certain drugs, introduced by Mr. MONTOYA (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 763

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

SECTION 1. It is the policy of the Congress that individuals insured under the supplementary medical insurance program established under part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act shall have complete freedom of choice in the selection of the community pharmacy from which they purchase drugs the expenses of which are covered under such program by reason of the amendments made by the succeeding provisions of this Act; and nothing in title XVIII of the Social Security Act or in the amendments to the Social Security Act made by this Act shall be construed to interfere with, restrict, or curtail such freedom of choice. It is further the policy of the Congress that nothing contained in the amendments to the Social Security Act made by the succeeding provisions of this Act, shall be construed in anywise to limit or to restrict the complete freedom of choice of any insured individual in the selection of his physician, limit or restrict any physician treating such individual in prescribing drugs for such individual's use, or limit or restrict any pharmacist in dispensing a prescribed drug for the use of such individual.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1832(a) of the Social Security Act is amended (1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (1), (2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) entitlement to have payment made to him (pursuant to sections 1833(a) (1) and (3) and 2845(a)(2)) toward expenses incurred in the purchase of qualified drugs."

(b) Section 1833(a) of such Act is amended (1) by inserting "or qualified drugs" after "incurs expenses for services", (2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) in the case of benefits covered under section 1832(a)(3), the allowable benefit (as defined in section 1845(a)(2)), or if lower, 80 percent of actual expenses incurred for the purchase of qualified drugs," (c) Section 1833(b) of such act is amended—

(1) by inserting "(insofar as subsection (a) relates to expenses incured with respect to services referred in paragraphs (1) and (2) thereof)" after "Before applying subsection (a)";

(2) by redesignating clauses (1) and (2) as clauses (A) and (B), respectively;

(3) by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(b)", and

(4) by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph (2):

"(2) Before applying subsection (a) (insofar as subsection (a) relates to expenses incurred with respect to qualified drugs, as referred to in paragraph (3) thereof) with respect to expenses incurred by an individual during any calendar year, the total amount of the expenses incurred by such individual during such year (which would, except for this subsection, constitute incurred expenses from which benefits under subsection (a) are determinable) shall be reduced by a deductible of $25; except that, for purposes of determining amounts to be counted toward meeting the $25 deductible imposed by this paragraph, 100 per centum of the actual expenses incurred by an individual with respect to all drugs requiring prescription under Federal law shall be used instead of the amount referred to in section 1832(a)(3)."

(d) Part B of title XVIII of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"ALLOWABLE BENEFITS FOR QUALIFIED DRUGS

"SEC. 1845. (a) For purposes of this part—

"(1) The term 'qualified drug' means a drug or biological for self-administration which (i) is included by strength and dosage forms among the drugs and biologicals approved by the Formulary Committtee (established pursuant to section 1846(a)) and (ii) is dispensed by a pharmacist from a pharmacy licensed under the laws of the State in which the drug or biological is provided,

or is otherwise dispensed in accordance with section 1861(s)(10).

"(2) The term 'allowable benefit', when used in connection with any quantity of a qualified drug means the payment amount established with regard to such qualified drug by the Formulary Committee and approved by the Secretary.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1842(b)(3)(B)(ii), amounts to which an individual is entitled by reason of the provisions of section 1832(a)(3) shall be paid directly to such individual in accordance with regulations of the Secretary prescribed pursuant to this subsection. No individual shall be paid any amount by reason of the provisions of section 1832(a)(3) prior to the presentation by him (or by another on his behalf) of documentary or other proof satisfactory to the Secretary establishing his entitlement thereto. Regulations referred to in the first sentence of this subsection shall provide that claims for amounts to which an individual is entitled by reason of section 1832(a)(3) shall be accepted by the Secretary only (i) in the case of a claim which is the first claim submitted in any calendar year with respect to expenses incurred in such year for drugs requiring lawful prescription, if the actual expenses for such drugs submitted with such claim and upon which such claim is based exceeds the amount of the deductible for such year (as determined under section 1833(b)(2)), (ii) in the case of a claim which, in any calendar year, is subsequent to the first claim submitted in such calendar year with respect to expenses for qualified drugs incurred in such year, if the actual expenses for qualified drugs upon which such claim is based is not less than $10, and (iii) in the case of a claim which is submitted in a calendar year subsequent to the calendar year with respect to which were incurred the expenses for qualified drugs upon which such claim is based, if the actual expenses for qualified drugs upon which such claim is based (when added to all claims eligible to be filed during the calendar year with respect to such expenses were incurred) exceeds the amount of the deductible for such year (as so determined).

"(c) The benefits provided by reason of section 1832(a)(3) may be paid by the Secretary or the Secretary may utilize the service of carriers or such other agencies qualified for the administration of such benefits under contracts entered into between the Secretary and such carriers for such purpose. To the extent determined by the Secretary to be appropriate, the provisions relating to contracts entered into pursuant to section 1842 shall be applicable to contracts entered into pursuant to this subsection.

"FORMULARY COMMITTEE

"SEC. 1846. (a) There is hereby established a Formulary Committee to consist of three officials, within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who are of appropriate professional background and who are designated by the Secretary. At least two of such officials shall be physicians. The chairman of such committee shall be designated by the Secretary and shall serve for such period of time as the Secretary deems appropriate.

"(b)(1) It shall be the duty of the Formulary Committee, with the advice of the Formulary advisory group (established pursuant to section 1847), to—

"(A) determine which drugs and biologicals shall constitute qualified drugs for purposes of the benefits provided under section 1832(a); and

"(B) determine, with the approval of the Secretary, the allowable benefit of the various quantities, strengths, or dosage forms of any drug or biological determined by the Committee to constitute a qualified drug; and

"(C) publish and disseminate at least once each calendar year among physicians, pharmacists, and other interested persons, in accordance with directive of the Secretary, (i) an alphabetical list naming each drug or biological by its established name and such other information as the Secretary deems necessary, and (ii) an indexed representative listing of such trade or other names by which such drug or biological is commonly known, together with the allowable benefit for various quantities, strengths, or dosage forms thereof, together with the names of the supplier of such drugs upon which the allowable benefit is based.

"(2)(A) Drugs and biologicals shall be determined to be qualified drugs if they can legally be obtained by the user only pursuant to a prescription of a lawful prescriber; except that the Formulary Committee may include certain drugs and biologicals not requiring such a prescription if it determines such drugs or biologicals to be of a lifesaving nature.

"(B) In the interest of orderly, economical, and equitable administration of the benefits provided under section 1832(a)(3), the Formulary Committee may, by regulation, provide that a drug or biological otherwise regarded as being a qualified drug shall not be so regarded when prescribed in unusual quantities.

"(3) In determining the allowable benefit for any quantity, dosage form, and strength of any qualified drug, the Formulary Committee shall seek to approximate the anticipated charges to beneficiaries and establish a payment amount that will include the acquisition cost to the ultimate dispenser of the qualified drug dispensed, plus—

"(A) in the case of a community pharmacy, (i) for a prescription-legend drug, a reasonable fee component to cover the costs of overhead and professional services attendant to the dispensing of a qualified drug and amount representing a fair profit, and (ii) for other drugs determined to be of a life-saving nature in accordance with section 1846(b)(2)(A), a billing allowance and an amount representing a fair profit; and

"(B) in the case of hospitals and extended care facilities, or when applicable, physicians (under section 1861(s)(10)), an allowance equal to the cost to the dispenser for providing the qualified drug.

In any case in which a qualified drug is available from more than one source, the acquisition cost of such qualified drug, for purposes of this section, shall be deemed to be the lowest cost of such drug, however named, which meets the quality and other standards for such drug required under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended. Whenever the lowest cost (to the ultimate dispensers thereof) of a particular drug or biological differs significantly in the various regions of the United States, or among the ultimate dispensers thereof, the Formulary Committee may establish, for the various regions of the United States, separate schedules of allowable benefits with respect to such drug or biological so as to reflect the lowest cost at which such drug or biological is generally available to the ultimate dispensers or among such dispensers thereof in each such region.

"ADVISORY GROUP TO FORMULARY COMMITTEE

"SEC. 1847. (a) For the purpose of providing professional, technical, and scientific advice to the Formulary Committee with respect to its duties and functions, the Secretary shall appoint an advisory group to the Formulary Committee (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'advisory group'). The advisory group shall consist of seven members to be appointed by the Secretary. From time to time, the Secretary shall designate one of the members of the advisory group to serve as chairman thereof. The members shall be so selected that each represents one or more of the following national professional health organizations: An organization of physicians, an organization of pharmacists, an organization of persons concerned with public health, an organization of colleges of medicine, and an organization of colleges of pharmacy. Each member shall hold office for a term of three years, except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and except that the terms of office of six of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the Secretary at the time of appointment, two at the end of the first year, and two at the end of the second year, and two at the end of the third year, after the date of appointment. A member shall not be eligible to serve continuously for more than two terms.

"(b) Members of the advisory group, while attending meetings or conferences thereof or otherwise serving on business of the advisory group, shall be entitled to receive compensation at rates to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $75 per day, including traveltime, and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(c) The advisory group is authorized to engage such technical assistance as may be required to carry out its functions, and the Secretary shall, in addition, make available to the advisory group such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data obtained and prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as the advisory group may require to carry out its functions."

(e)(1) Section 1861 (s) of the Social Security Act is amended by (1) striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (8), (2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (9) and in lieu of such period insert "; and", and (3) by adding immediately after paragraph (9) the following new paragraph:

"(10) qualified drugs for self-administration (as defined in section 1845(a)(1)) dispensed by a physician (i) in an emergency (but not routinely), or (ii) when adequate community pharmaceutical services are not otherwise available, as determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary."

(2) Section 1861(s) is further amended by redesignating paragraphs (10) through (13) as paragraphs (11) through (14), respectively.

(f) Section 1861(t) of the Social Security Act is amended (1) by striking out "such drugs and biologicals, respectively, as are included (or approved for inclusion) in the United States Pharmacopoeia, the National Formulary, or the United States Pharmacopoeia, or in New Drugs or Accepted Dental Remedies (except for any drugs and biologicals unfavorably evaluated therein)" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "qualified drugs, as designated under section 1845(a)(1)", (2) by inserting "or extended care facility" after "hospital", and (3) by striking out "hospitals" and inserting in lieu thereof institutions".

(g) The amendments made by this section shall become effective on January 1, 1971.

S. 764—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO ESTABLISH AN INTERNATIONAL HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND LABOR PROGRAM

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the nations of the world need to know us on a peaceful basis. We should seek to relate to the other nations of the world through education and science, through arts and the humanities. We could help

meet some of the world's needs in these kinds of fields, and promote understanding at the same time.

Some few Government organizations, such as the Peace Corps, and private foundations and organizations, have undertaken the tasks of understanding. Funding for private organizations, however, has been hard to obtain, and a great many of these private foundations were only able to obtain funds from the Central Intelligence Agency. It is necessary that these organizations be able to receive their funds from more public and positive sources. There is now no provision for this kind of funding.

Our Government can help these organizations. In order to provide some funds of this type, I am pleased to introduce a bill to establish an international health, education, and labor program to provide support for private, nongovernmental activities in the fields of health, education, and labor, as well as other welfare fields. It is designed to, first, provide the people of the world better understanding of the United States; second, to promote unity among the people of the world, and, third, to promote and aid free and independent societies for all the people of the world.

In order to have strong leadership for this program, the bill provides that a single director will be appointed by the President, with the aid and counsel of the Senate. The Director shall be assisted by an 11-member council to advise him. Members of the council shall be in the fields of education, labor, health, and research; they shall not be employees or officers of the U.S. Government.

The Director shall make grants for the purpose of aiding certain organizations to participate in conferences, meetings, and seminars dealing with the fields of health, education, labor, and welfare. These certain organizations shall be private, nonprofit organizations, public or private nonprofit educational institutions, and to individuals not employed by Federal, State, or local governments. All activities relating to these grants shall be conducted openly. The Director may require reports to determine the distribution of the grants; however, he is not allowed to make any stipulation upon such grants that prohibits or inhibits the free speech and thought of the recipient of such a grant.

There are specific provisions in the bill referring to the use of grants for "intelligence-gathering activity"; section 7 of this bill forbids any requiring of intelligence gathering by the program to any recipient of these grants.

This bill authorizes the appropriation funds for the first 5 years of the program to facilitate long-range planning for the program. A total sum of $100 million is authorized for the period extending to June 30, 1972; I hope that further appropriations would be made on a 5-year basis. By making multiyear appropriations, we might facilitate the transferral of funds from Government hands to those of private organizations.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 764) to establish an international health, education, and labor program to provide open support for private, nongovernmental activities in the fields of health, education, and labor, and other welfare fields, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 764

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

ESTABLISHMENT OF FOUNDATION

SECTION 1. (a) There is hereby established as an independent agency of the Government an International Health, Education, and Labor Foundation (hereinafter referred to as the "Foundation").

(b) The Foundation shall be composed of a Director and an International Health, Education, and Labor Council (hereinafter referred to as the "Council").

(c) The purposes of the Foundation shall be establish and conduct an international health, education, and labor program under which the Foundation shall provide open support for private, nongovernmental activities in the fields of health, education, and labor, and other welfare fields, designed—

(1) to promote a better knowledge of the United States among the peoples of the world;

(2) to increase friendship and understanding among the peoples of the world; and

(3) to strengthen the capacity of the other peoples of the world to develop and maintain free, independent societies in their own nations.

DIRECTOR OF FOUNDATION

SEC. 2. (a) The Foundation shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The person nominated for appointment as the Director shall be a distinguished citizen who has demonstrated exceptional qualities and abilities necessary to enable him to successfully perform the functions of the office of the Director.

(b) The Director shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level II of the Executive Schedule under section 5311 of title 5, United States Code, and shall serve for a term of five years.

(c) The Director, with the advice of the Council, shall exercise all of the authority granted to the Foundation by this Act and shall serve as chief executive officer of the Foundation.

COUNCIL

SEC. 3. (a) The Council shall consist of eleven members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The persons nominated for appointment as members of the Council (1) shall be eminent in the fields of education, student activities, youth activities, labor, health, scientific research, or other fields pertinent to the functions of the Foundation; (2) shall be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service; and (3) shall not be officers or employees of the Government of the United States. The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by leading private associations, institutions, and organizations concerned with private activities in the fields of health, education, and labor, and other welfare fields related to the purposes set forth in the first section of this Act.

(b) The term of office of each member of the Council shall be six years, except that (1) the terms of the members first appointed shall expire, as designated by the President, three at the end of two years, four at the end of four years, and four at the end of six years after the date of enactment of this Act; and (2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy shall serve for the remainder of the term for which his predecessor was appointed. No member shall be eligible for reappointment during the two-year period following the expiration of his term.

(c) The members of the Council shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 for each day engaged in the business of the Foundation and shall be allowed travel expenses as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) The President shall call the first meeting of the Council and designate an Acting Chairman. The Board shall, from time to time thereafter, select one of its members to serve as Chairman of the Council.

(e) The Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman, but not less than once every six months. Six members of the Council shall constitute a quorum.

(f) The Council (1) shall advise the Director with respect to policies, programs, and procedures for carrying out his functions, and (2) shall review applications for financial support submitted pursuant to section 4 and make recommendations thereon to the Director. The Director shall not approve or disapprove any such application until he has received the recommendation of the Council thereon, unless the Council fails to make a recommendation on such application within a reasonable time.

(g) The Council shall, on or before the 31st day of January, of each year, submit an annual report to the President and the Congress summarizing the activities of the Council during the preceding calendar year and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate. The contents of each report so submitted shall promptly be made available to the public.

GRANTS IN SUPPORT OF PRIVATE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 4. (a) To effectuate the purposes of this Act, the Director is authorized, subject to section 3(f), to make grants to private, nonprofit agencies, associations, and organizations organized in the United States, to public or private nonprofit educational institutions located in the United States, and to individuals or groups of individuals who are citizens of the United States not employed by the Government of the United States, a State or political subdivision of a State, or the District of Columbia, for the purpose of enabling them to assist, provide, or participate in international activities, conferences, meetings, and seminars in the fields of health, education, and labor, and other welfare fields related to the purposes set forth in the first section of this Act. No portion of any funds granted under this section shall be paid by the Director, or by any recipient of a grant under this section, to support any intelligence-gathering activity on behalf of the United States or to support any activity carried on by any officer or employee of the United States.

(b) Each grant shall be made by the Director under this section only upon application therefor in such form and containing such information as may be required by the Director and only on condition that the recipient of such grant will conduct openly all activities supported by such grant and make such reports as the Director may require solely to determine that the funds so granted are applied to the purpose for which application is made.

(c) The Director shall develop procedures and rules with respect to the approval or disapproval of applications for grants under this section which will provide, insofar as practicable, an equitable distribution of

grants among the various applicants for such grants and types of activities to be supported by such grants, but which will assure that grants will be made to those qualified recipients most capable of achieving a successful or significant contribution favorably related to the purposes set forth in the first section of this Act. In making grants under this section, the Director shall not impose any requirements therefor or conditions thereon which impair the freedom of thought and expression of any recipients or other beneficiaries of such grants.

(d) The Director may (1) pay grants in such installments as he may deem appropriate and (2) provide for such adjustment of payments under this section as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, total withholding of payments.

PUBLIC REPORTS BY DIRECTOR

SEC. 5. The Director shall, on or before the 31st day of January each year, submit an annual report to the President and the Congress setting forth a summary of his activities under this Act during the preceding calendar year. Such report shall include a list of the grants made by the Director during the preceding calendar year; a statement of the use to which each recipient applied any grant received during the preceding calendar year; and any recommendations which the Director may deem appropriate. The contents of each report so submitted shall promptly be made available to the public.

GENERAL AUTHORITY

SEC. 6. The Director shall have the authority, within the limits of funds available under section 9, to—

(1) prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary governing the manner of the operations of the Foundation, and its organization and personnel;

(2) appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to enable the Foundation to carry out its functions under this Act, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service and the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates: except that the salary of any person so employed shall not exceed the maximum salary established by the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code;

(3) obtain the services of experts and consultants from private life, as may be required by the Director or the Council, in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of title 5, United States Code;

(4) accept and utilize on behalf of the Foundation the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel from private life and reimburse them for travel expenses, including per diem, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code;

(5) receive money and other property donated, bequeathed, or devised, by private, nongovernmental sources, without condition or restriction other than that it be used for any of the purposes of the Foundation; and to use, sell, or otherwise dispose of such property in carrying out the purposes of this Act; and

(6) make other expenditures necessary to carry into effect the purposes of this Act.

PROHIBITION AGAINST REQUIRING INTELLIGENCE GATHERING

SEC. 7. No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall request or require any recipient or any other beneficiary of any grant made under this Act to obtain, furnish, or report, or cause to be obtained, furnished, or reported, any information relating, directly or indirectly, to any activity supported by such grant, except as is (1) provided by section 4(b) of this Act or (2) authorized under law in the case of any information directly relating to the violation of any criminal law of the United States by such recipient or beneficiary.

INDEPENDENCE FROM EXECUTIVE CONTROL

SEC. 8. (a) Determinations made by the Director and the Council in the discharge of their functions under this Act shall not be subject to review or control by the President or by any other department, agency, officer, or employee of the Government.

(b) The provisions of subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code (relating to administrative procedure), and of chapter 7 of such title (relating to judicial review), shall not apply with respect to the exercise by the Director or the Council of their functions under this Act.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, except that the aggregate of such sums appropriated prior to June 30, 1972, shall not exceed $100 million. Sums appropriated under this section shall remain available until expended.

S. 765—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO PROVIDE FOR A NATIONAL LUNG INSTITUTE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation that would authorize the establishment of a National Lung Institute as a part of the National Institutes of Health. This Institute is needed to mobilize our research and training resources against emphysema, chronic bronchitis, and other respiratory diseases such as pneumoconiosis, sometimes known as miners' asthma.

Emphysema, chronic bronchitis, and asthma combined now rank among the 10 leading causes of death—primarily due to the dramatic rise in mortality caused by emphysema in recent years. Deaths due to emphysema increased by 64 percent between 1962 and 1966 as compared to an overall increase of 6 percent for all causes of death. Last year 24,000 of our citizens died due to emphysema. It is estimated that some 5 million Americans are affected with emphysema. In recent years emphysema has forced approximately 16,000 workers to retire prematurely at an annual cost of $90 million in social security benefits. Emphysema is the second most frequent disability for which benefits are awarded. Heart disease is first.

It is believed that emphysema, a disease which causes the lungs to become enlarged, is a late effect of chronic infection or irritation of the bronchial tubes. When they become irritated or infected the lungs as a whole may become enlarged, at the same time becoming less efficient in exchanging oxygen for carbon dioxide. Emphysema may also interfere with the passage of blood through the small blood vessels of the lung. As interference grows, the heart must work harder to pump blood. The heart may enlarge under the strain and eventually give out. This type of heart failure is often the end result of emphysema.

Very little money is now being invested in research to prevent and treat emphysema and in training medical personnel in the diagnosis and treatment of the disease. The growing deaths and disability due to emphysema make it imperative that we provide for the needed research and training for a concerted attack. We are now spending only $3.6 million on research and training against emphysema, largely through the program of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases. It is understandable that the Institute gives priority to allergic and infectious illness. But it is no less urgent that we provide organizationally for an attack on emphysema, chronic bronchitis, and other diseases of the lung so that we can attract the number of scientists and physicians that are desperately needed in the fields of research and practice that we may advance our knowledge in preventing and treating chronic respiratory diseases. I want to make it clear that the proposed National Lung Institute would in no way duplicate the work of any other National Institute of Health.

This legislation is endorsed by the National Tuberculosis and Respiratory Disease Foundation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in full at the end of my remarks following an article from the New York Times of January 27, 1969, that describes the plight of miners in West Virginia who are afflicted with what is commonly known as miners' asthma or black lung. I am confident that the proposed National Lung Institute would add to our knowledge in preventing and treating this illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and article will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 765) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Lung Institute, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 765

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C., ch. 6A, subch. III) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART G—NATIONAL LUNG INSTITUTE

"ESTABLISHMENT

"SEC. 461. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereafter in this part referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized and directed to establish in the Public Health Service an institute for the conduct and support of research and training relating to emphysema and other chronic respiratory diseases, including but not limited to such conditions as chronic bronchitis, asthma, and tuberculosis, as well as research and training in the special health problems and requirements of persons afflicted with such diseases, and conditions of the lung.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF ADVISORY COUNCIL

"SEC. 462. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to establish an advisory council to advise, consult with, and make recommendations to him on matters relating to the activities of the National Lung Institute.

"(b) The provisions relating to the composition, terms of office of members, and reappointment of members of advisory councils under section 432(a) shall be applicable to the council established under this section.

"(c) Upon appointment of such council, it shall assume all or such part as the Secretary may specify of the duties, functions, and powers of the National Advisory Health Council relating to the research or training projects with which such council established under this part is concerned and such portion as the Secretary may specify of the duties, functions, and powers of any other advisory council established under this Act relating to such projects.

"FUNCTIONS

"SEC. 463. The Secretary shall, through the National Lung Institute established under this part, carry out the purposes of section 301 with respect to the conduct and support of research on the lung and its conditions with special emphasis on emphysema and other chronic respiratory diseases, including the special health problems and requirements of persons afflicted with such diseases, except that the Secretary shall determine the areas in which and the extent to which he will carry out such purposes of section 301 through such institute or an institute established by or under other provisions of this Act, or both of them, when both such institutes have functions with respect to the same subject matter. The Secretary is also authorized to provide training and instruction and establish and maintain traineeships and fellowships, in the National Lung Institute and elsewhere in matters relating to diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of emphysema and related respiratory diseases and conditions of the lung with such stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) for trainees and fellows as he deems necessary, and in addition, provide for such training, instruction, and traineeships and for such fellowships through grants to public or other non-profit institutions."

The article presented by Mr. YARBOROUGH is as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 27, 1969]

MINERS ORGANIZE TO REDUCE RISKS—HIT UNION AND GOVERNMENT ON HEALTH AND SAFETY

(By Ben A. Franklin)

CHARLESTON, W. VA., January 26.—They are strangers to the tactics of protest, but more than 3,000 coal miners in West Virginia demonstrated here today that they could be organized to make unexpectedly militant demands upon both their union and their government to reduce the risks of their occupation.

The setting was the first statewide meeting of the West Virginia Black Lung Association, a new miners' organization inspired by the work of three doctors in seeking to reduce the fatal incidence of pneumoconiosis, sometimes called miners' asthma, but popularly known as black lung.

The rally produced an unusually bitter attack on W. A. Boyle, president of the United Mine Workers of America, by Ralph Nader, outspoken advocate of auto safety and other consumer issues. Mr. Nader accused Mr. Boyle of "snuggling up close to the coal operators" on safety issues and suggested that the union president be ousted.

The disabling disease pneumoconiosis was identified two decades ago as an occupational hazard different from silicosis, the most widely known affliction of underground miners. Black lung has been estimated by the United States Health Service to affect more than 100,000 of the country's 135,000 soft coal workers, yet almost nothing has been done to abate it or to indemnify its victims when they can no longer work.

A 2-HOUR MEETING

Today, for nearly two hours in the Charleston Civic Center coal miners from across the state—some in ill-fitting suits and others in the hard hats and coveralls they wear into the pits—cheered and applauded demands that the Legislature now meeting here grant them workmen's compensation for the disabling symptoms of black lung.

They also demanded that mine owners make radical changes in their underground operations to remove the particles of coal dust that cause black lung disease.

It was the first time in the memory of most living West Virginia miners that workers in an industry noted for the fatalism and rural isolation of its men had banded together in such an organization. Representative Ken Hechler, Democrat of West Virginia, told the miners it was "a history-making day," unlike anything in the coal fields since the union organizing wars between the mine operators and the mine workers unions in the 1920's and 1930's.

By approving unanimously a curt public "invitation" to Mr. Boyle to come to West Virginia and by applauding a charge that the union president had "neglected his responsibility" to miners, the rally showed the existence of angry rank-and-file dissatisfaction with the union leadership.

Although he was obviously uneasy about what he called its "warm language," Representative Hechler read in full the two-and-a-half page attack on the coal industry and on Mr. Boyle prepared for the meeting by Nader. Mr. Nader himself did not appear.

STATEMENT FROM NADER

His statement denounced the industry for health and safety failures "that make the lives of coal miners cheaper than coal." It took a crack at state legislators in this coal-dominated state, "who must be taught that they were elected to represent people, not coal," and it attacked the company doctors who control much of the workman's compensation procedure as "puppet physicians."

But Mr. Nader aimed most of his attack at the union president. "I doubt whether there is any union in this country whose highly paid leadership has been as insensitive and inactive toward health and safety conditions," Mr. Nader's statement declared.

"The record is overwhelming that Mr. Tony Boyle has neglected his responsibility to protect coal miners."

Mr. Nader's criticism included what he called the union's failure to include provisions for compensation for black lung disease in the union contract, to demand stricter state and Federal enforcement of mine health and safety rules and to initiate health and safety reforms on its own.

The statement said that "you may conclude that Mr. Boyle is no longer worthy of being your leader, that you need new leadership that will fight for your rights and not snuggle close to the coal operators and forget about the men who are paying the dues and paying the price."

Although Mr. Hechler read Mr. Nader's attack in a hurried, nervous monotone, it was applauded and a resolution "inviting" Mr. Boyle to West Virginia was adopted amid more applause.

S. 766—INTRODUCTION OF THE UNFAIR COMPETITION ACT OF 1969

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and Mr. SCOTT, the Unfair Competition Act of 1969.

The bill would establish a uniform body of Federal unfair competition law by creating a Federal statutory tort of unfair competition affecting interstate commerce, and by establishing Federal jurisdiction over such tort claims within the framework of the Trademark Act of 1946. The crux of the bill proposes a new section 43(a) of the Trademark Act including in three subsections those torts generally acknowledged to give rise to the major part of the law of unfair competition. In a fourth subsection, provision is made for the Federal courts to deal with other acts which constitute unfair competition because of misrepresentation or misappropriation of goods or services.

The bill provides that all of the remedies set forth in the Trademark Act for infringement of trademarks would be available in respect to acts of unfair competition. However, the bill would not affect remedies which are otherwise available or preempt the jurisdiction of any State in cases of unfair competition.

The need for legislation in this area has been widely recognized. A national coordinating committee, composed of leading business and legal organizations, was established for the purpose of fostering such legislation. The bill which Senator SCOTT and I are introducing today is substantially similar to S. 1154 which we introduced in the 90th Congress. We have incorporated in the new text certain constructive suggestions proposed by the section of antitrust law and the patent, trademark, and copyright section of the American Bar Association. This revised text of the bill has been endorsed by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association, the American Patent Law Association, and the U.S. Trademark Association.

I anticipate that this bill will be referred to the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary. It is my present intention to schedule public hearings on this bill later in this session of Congress. Anyone interested in this legislation should address his comments to the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 766) to amend the act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MCCLELLAN (for himself and Mr. SCOTT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 769—INTRODUCTION OF BILL HONORING THE LATE TENNESSEE CONGRESSMAN, ROBERT A. "FATS" EVERETT

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill honoring the late Tennessee Congressman, Robert A. "Fats" Everett, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

The bill (S. 769) to name the bridge to be constructed across the Mississippi River linking the States of Tennessee and Missouri in honor of a former Member of the House, Robert A. "Fats" Everett, introduced by Mr. BAKER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 769

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Tennessee-Missouri Bridge now under construction across the Mississippi River northwest of Dyersburg, Tennessee, and southeast of Caruthersville, Missouri, be named the Robert A. Everett Memorial Bridge in honor of the late Congressman Robert A. "Fats" Everett.

S. 770—INTRODUCTION OF BILL RELATING TO FEDERAL COUNCIL OF HEALTH

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a 12-member Federal Council of Health within the Executive Office of the President.

Duties of the Council members, appointed by the President for 3-year terms, would include. first, making recommendations and continuous evaluation of policies and programs related to the Nation's health, including disaster planning; second, initiating, studying, and developing measures designed to assure the provision of adequate health manpower, services, and facilities and to moderate the rising trend in the cost of medical care; and, third, advising and consulting with Federal departments and agencies, including the Budget Bureau, on policies and programs concerned with health services, manpower, and facilities.

This measure would bring into being the recommendations of the Task Force on Federal Medical Services of the Second Hoover Commission, which have been ignored for 14 years. While temporary, short-term groups such as Presidential commissions, ad hoc committees, and interagency committees have been created to deal with specific problems in the health field, none of these groups has had the scope or power of the recommended Federal Council of Health. This bill also has the support of the American Public Health Association.

A major concern of American families today is the accelerating cost of health services, which have risen considerably faster than consumer prices generally, and the increasing difficulty in obtaining the health services desired. While physician's fees have risen twice as fast as the cost of living, the Nation has actually seen a decline in the number of family physicians such as general practitioners, pediatricians, and internists and a decline in the ratio of dentists serving our people. In addition, one-third of the Nation's hospital capacity is outmoded and outdated.

There can be no other conclusion than that the Nation is facing a major health crisis as medical costs increase and as health facilities fail to keep pace with population growth, scientific advances and the increasing ability of Americans to avail themselves of health care.

The Federal Council on Health which my bill proposes could bring together the findings and recommendations of the various Federal ad hoc groups on such subjects as health manpower and medicare prices and the health planning groups in the States, and make findings and recommendations of its own so that the Nation can adequately meet the health care crisis coming upon us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be included as a part of my remarks at this point the full text of the recommendations for a Federal Council of Health by the Task Force on Federal Medical Services of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—the Hoover Commission.

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

CHAPTER II: A FEDERAL COUNCIL OF HEALTH

There is a general absence of coordinated planning and operation of the widely dispersed health activities of the Federal Government. Moreover, Government agencies fail to relate these activities to the Nation's total health efforts. The validity of these observations is well recognized. They have been made by a number of governmental commissions and other groups who have carefully studied the many facets of the health problems of the Nation. The seriousness of their import compels their reiteration here.

In large measure these circumstances exist because the responsibility for the recommendation of overall Federal policies relating to the conduct of health activities is not fixed in any unit of the executive branch. Consequently there are no such overall policies. Excessive duplication of programs, facilities, and personnel ensue for lack of policy. Not only do such excesses impair the economic and efficient operation of the Federal health activities, they also place unreasonably heavy claims upon the Nation's total health economy.

As a consequence of our studies, we have made numerous recommendations. In many ways our recommendations, however, can be put into lasting effect only if they become the explicit responsibility of a permanent council. We clearly see the need for a council that can and will have at its disposal a convincing and growing mass of factual information, provide continuity and consistency in the advice and criticism and suspicions of an operating agency, and yet possess a status sufficient to avoid having its advice easily ignored or overridden.

Federal activities constitute so substantial a portion of the total national health resources that the demands of the Federal health services can scarcely be met. We find it of fundamental importance in order (*a*) to attain economic and efficient operation of the Federal health activities, (*b*) to utilize effectively the Nation's health resources, and (*c*) to prepare medically for national defense, that there be created an agency within the executive branch charged with the responsibility for formulation and continuous evaluation of policies for the conduct of Federal health activities and the recommendation of overall policy.

These objectives may be reached through three possible methods. The first is to place substantially all of the health activities in a single department of cabinet rank and charge this department with the responsibility of policy formulation. The task force rejects this solution. In arriving at this conclusion we differ from that reached by the first Hoover Commission for a United Medical Administration which would have encompassed this method.[1]

Since 1948 there have been basic changes in the organization of the Federal medical services. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been created. The Department of Defense has been created from the National Military Establishment; and a position of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health and Medical) has been established. In the Veterans' Administration, the Department of Medicine and Surgery has been given much broader authority. Both executive policy and legislative action have been in the direction of strengthening these centers of medical service.

We find that the mission of health activities in the Department of Defense is sufficiently different from the missions of health activities in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Veterans' Administration to warrant their continued separation. We further believe that the accomplishment of the Defense health mission, which is not only primarily but inextricably related to the provision of technical support to military operations, would be seriously hampered, if not jeopardized, by such a merger. In view of these circumstances we believe that the real need today is the development of an instrument to coordinate policy, rather than an integration of services in a single agency.

The second method is to permit the present decentralized administration of health activities to continue but to assign a staff responsibility for policy formulation for the entire Federal Government to a cabinet officer of an appropriate department. The task force is of the firm conviction that such an assignment would not accomplish the desired result. We believe that no officer of an operating agency could long remain sufficiently detached from the problems and activities of his own department to permit him to view objectively policy matters concerning other agencies, both military and civilian.

The third possibility is to place this function in the Executive Office of the President. We favor this solution. Two established units within this office might conceivably serve this function: The Bureau of the Budget and the Office of Defense Mobilization. Both now engage in operations having some relationship to health activities.

As to the Bureau of the Budget, we feel that the function of broad policy formulation is substantially if not wholly alien to its present activities. This Bureau is primarily concerned with the management evaluation and fiscal control of Government agencies and operations. Since 1949 both the Congress and the President have extended the Bureau's authority and functions in the field of organization and management of the executive branch.[2] Moreover the authority to establish budgetary reserves was added by the Omnibus Appropriation Act of September 6, 1950. In the view of the executive and legislative branches of Government these areas apparently are the proper province of the Bureau.

These functions are so contrasting if not actually antithetical to those concerned with the formation of health policy that no one agency could effectively perform both. The assumption of such a role would, in our view, unbalance the present alinement of function and activities of the Bureau. It would give the Bureau a policy role in the field of health that it does not possess for any other activity of Government.

For these reasons this task force does not believe that responsibility for the formulation of health policy should be placed in the Bureau of the Budget.

As between the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of Defense Mobilization, we favor placement of this function in the latter agency for the following reasons:

---

[1] Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, Medical Activities, a Report to the Congress, March 1949, Recommendation No. 1.

[2] Budgeting and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. Sup. 18a, 18b); Rev. Stat., sec. 3679 as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. Sup. 1151); and Executive Order 10072 of July 29, 1949.

1. The experience of the Health Resources Advisory Committee, operating within the Office of Defense Mobilization, has demonstrated that certain Government-wide policy formulation relating to health can be successfully accomplished in this setting.

2. The Office of Defense Mobilization has representation, through its Director, on the National Security Council. This would permit realistic policy formulation with respect to matters pertaining to the national defense.

We recognize that placement of this function in the Office of Defense Mobilization also has limitations. It was established in the Executive Office of the President to improve the organization of that Office and to enable a single agency of that Office to exercise leadership in our mobilization effort, including current defense activities and preparedness for future national emergencies.[3] While health is related to some of these functions, it is neither the sole nor a major concern of this agency. We feel that the envisioned health functions are far too important to be cast lightly about in search of a convenient rather than a realistic situs. This function belongs in the Executive Office of the President, and if it is to be given to any existing agency, the task force believes it can best be given to the Office of Defense Mobilization.

The task force is well aware that much work which has been independently and severally conducted by a number of Federal agencies in the field of health has been highly competent. In fact some of such work has been particularly outstanding. The criticism which the task force has addressed to the lack of coordinated planning and operation with respect to the health activities of the Federal Government, and particularly to the relationship that such activities have to the total health needs of the Nation, is not intended to reflect on nor does it relate to the competence and devotion of many of the highly skilled scientists in this field.

Some idea of what may be accomplished through coordinated policy formulation is readily gleaned from the experience of the Health Resources Advisory Committee. That Committee, a civilian group, was appointed in 1950 at the suggestion of the President to advise the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board and to make recommendations to him in the entire field of health resources essential in a national emergency. When the functions of the National Security Resources Board were transferred to the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Health Resources Advisory Committee was also placed in the new agency. This committee carries a number of broad responsibilities, including review of quotas of the Defense Department for physicians, dentists, nurses, and veterinarians, acting as the Advisory Committee to the Selective Service for the purposes of the Doctor-Draft Law, and serving as arbiter for the national blood program which cuts across the areas of interest of a number of agencies.

We recommend that a Federal Council of Health be established, that membership on the Council be limited to approximately 10 persons of distinguished competence in the health field as broadly defined, and that their general responsibilities would include:

(1) To make recommendations and continuous evaluation of policies and programs related to the Nation's health, including disaster planning;

(2) To initiate, study, and develop measures designed to assure the provision of adequate manpower, services, and facilities for the Nation's health, including their mobilization, allocation, and utilization;

(3) To evaluate studies and surveys made by or concerned with the Federal departments and agencies in relation to the Nation's health needs and resources;

(4) To advise and consult with Federal departments and agencies, including the Bureau of the Budget, on policies and programs concerned with health services, manpower, and facilities;

(5) To advise the Selective Service System and coordinate the work of State and local volunteer advisory committees on the selection for service in the Armed Forces of medical, dental, and allied specialists.

(6) To report to the President on such matters as the President may request.

The members of the Council should be appointed for terms of fixed duration, with the possibility of reappointment. Our feeling is that the terms of the members should be staggered in such fashion as to provide continuity of operations, and the maintenance of high interest.

THE TASK FORCE RECOMMENDS

That legislation be enacted to establish within the Executive Office of the President a Federal Council of Health charged with the recommendation and continuous evaluation of policy governing the health activities of the Federal Government.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 770) to establish a Federal Council of Health which will have the responsibility of fixing a coherent set of national health goals for the United States; introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 770

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established, in the Executive Office of the President, a Federal Council of Health (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"), which shall consist of twelve members who shall be of distinguished competence in the field of health or fields related thereto, and who are not otherwise in the employ of the United States. Members of the Council shall be appointed by the President. At the time of appointment the President shall designate one member as Chairman of the Council.

(b) Each member of the Council shall hold office for a term of three years, except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and except that the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, four at the end of the first year, four at the end of the second year, and four at the end of the third year, after the date of appointment. A member shall not be eligible to serve continuously for more than two terms.

(c) Members of the Council, while attending meetings or conferences thereof or otherwise serving on business of the Council, shall be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the President, but not exceeding $100 per day, including traveltime, and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty and function of the Council to conduct studies, research, and investigations for the purpose of establishing a coherent set of national health goals.

(b) In carrying out its duty and function, the Council shall—

(1) conduct a continuous evaluation of policies and programs related to the Nation's health (including policies and programs related to disaster planning) and make recommendations for the revision, expansion, and improvement of such policies and programs;

(2) initiate, study, and develop measures designed to assure the provision of adequate manpower, services, and facilities for the Nation's health, including the mobilization, allocation, and utilization of such manpower, services, and facilities;

(3) evaluate studies and surveys made by or concerned with departments and agencies of the Federal Government in relation to the Nation's health needs and resources;

(4) advise and consult with departments and agencies of the Federal Government (including the Bureau of the Budget) on policies and programs concerned with health services, manpower, and facilities; and

(5) upon the request of the President with respect to any matter concerning the Nation's health, submit to the President a report containing such information, data, or recommendations on such matter as the President may indicate in such request.

SEC. 3. The Council shall have authority to employ such professional, technical, and clerical staff as may be required to carry out its duties and functions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the junior Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 583), to provide for the flying of the American flag over the remains of the U.S. ship *Utah* in honor of the heroic men who were entombed in her hull on December 7, 1941.

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

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) be added as a cosponsor of S. 18, a bill to exempt the National Park Service from certain employee limitations.

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

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, also I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 740) to establish an Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs.

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

Mr. MONTOYA. Senator Moss was one of the original cosponsors of this bill, but, through an error in printing, his name was omitted from the list of cosponsors on the first printing.

Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN), the Senator from

---

[3] See Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1953, 67 Stat. 634.

Nevada (Mr. BIBLE), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), be added as cosponsors of my bill (S. 413) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with and furnish financial and other assistance to States and other public bodies and organizations in establishing a system for prevention, control, and suppression of fires in rural areas, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the senior Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 740) to establish the Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the senior Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIRKSEN), and the senior Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY), be added as cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 28) providing for renaming the central Arizona project as the Carl Hayden project.

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

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) be added as cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 29) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the establishment of Yellowstone National Park, and for other purposes.

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

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 7—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION FOR AN EFFECTIVE INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT ON HIJACKING

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I submit, for reference to the appropriate committee, a concurrent resolution which seeks to deal with the growing problem of hijacking by recommending the strengthening of the Tokyo Convention.

I believe we are all agreed that, somehow, effective means must be found to put an end to the growing international epidemic of hijacking of commercial planes. This epidemic has now reached such proportions in the Western Hemisphere that no passenger on a commercial flight in the Caribbean area can be certain that his flight will not terminate in Havana.

Last year 17 American planes, three Colombian, two Venezuelan, one Bahamian, and three Mexican aircraft were hijacked and flown to Cuba.

In the first few weeks of this year, 10 commercial aircraft, bound for other destinations in the Americas, have been forced at gunpoint to fly to Havana.

I should point out that these were the figures as of 1 day ago, when advance copies of my statement were distributed to the press. Within the past 24 hours, however, another two aircraft were hijacked to Cuba, to swell the total for the month of January to 12 hijackings. If this rate keeps up, more than 150 commercial aircraft will be hijacked during the year 1969.

Obviously, this is a situation that cannot be tolerated.

It has been maintained by some people, and the Department of State has given some support to this analysis, that the Castro regime has had nothing to do with the epidemic of hijackings and is, in fact, unhappy about them.

This is a dangerous oversimplification.

Admittedly, many of the hijackers have been non-Cubans with criminal or mental records, who clearly acted on their own. But there have been a disturbing number of incidents in which known Castroites, presumably acting under directive, have been involved in the hijacking of aircraft flying the flag of various American countries.

The authoritative bulletin, Latin America Report, in its issue of November 1968, pointed out the following:

> In one instance, Castroite guerrillas in Colombia hijacked a plane and returned their wounded to Cuba on it. The FBI recently arrested two Puerto Ricans for hijacking a New York-San Juan plane and identified them as members of the Castroite Pro-Independence Movement. All three hijackings from Venezuela were the work of Castro agents who have been identified by the Venezuelan government as such.

If Castro were really unhappy about the hijacking and wanted to put an end to it, he could have done so overnight a long time ago by announcing that all those who hijacked aircraft in order to get to Cuba would be extradited immediately on their arrival.

There are good reasons for believing that there have been some indirect overtures to Castro. But so far he has shown himself completely uncooperative. To me, it is clear that Castro is not unhappy about the hijackings. I believe that he enjoys the present situation enormously and that he hopes to be able to exploit it in order to extort some major political concessions from the United States.

Given this situation, it is clear that we cannot hope for Castro's cooperation unless we succeed in isolating him, at least on the single issue of hijacking, from the community of nations. To do this, an agreement that has some real teeth in it will be essential.

In 1963 a first convention on hijacking was concluded in Tokyo, obligating the signatory states to facilitate the release of hijacked aircraft, together with their passengers and crews. Although the Tokyo Convention represented a first step in the direction of controlling the problem, the inadequacy of its provisions failed to inspire any international enthusiasm. To date, only 23 nations have signed the convention and only 8 have ratified it. The United States is a signatory, but has not yet got around to ratification.

The Tokyo Convention is inadequate because, as it is now written, it simply has no teeth. The purpose of my resolution is to provide the Tokyo Convention with some teeth.

Specifically, my resolution suggests that strengthening clauses be added to the Tokyo Convention:

First. Calling for the immediate release of hijacked aircraft, together with their crews and passengers; second, calling for the automatic extradition of all hijackers to the flag country of the hijacked aircraft; and third, making it mandatory for the signatory nations to terminate bilateral air transport arrangements with any country that refuses to become a party to the new International Convention on Hijacking.

The matter of strengthening the Tokyo Convention or finding some alternative formula has been under consideration by the International Civil Aviation Organization since last September.

At that time the General Assembly of ICAO asked the Council of the Organization to undertake a study of the subject.

The council, in turn, in December of last year, assigned the question to the IACO legal committee.

And the legal committee assigned the question to a specially designated subcommittee which is to meet in Montreal from February 10 to 22 of this year.

It is my hope that the American representatives at this meeting will move to strengthen the Tokyo Convention in the manner proposed by my resolution. Anything less than this, I fear, would give us a treaty that is not adequate to deal with the situation that confronts us today.

But I also hope that the need for strengthening the Tokyo Convention in the manner I have suggested will be accepted by the other delegations to the Montreal meeting, and by all those governments which have ratified or signed the Tokyo Convention to date.

If the machinery of the International Civil Aviation Organization proves inadequate or too slow moving to bring the epidemic of hijacking under control in the immediate future, or if the present signatories of the Tokyo Convention resist strengthening it in a manner that will make the agreement meaningful, then I believe that we should seek to deal with the problem through a special international conference, convened on an emergency basis not later than March 31, 1969.

This latter proposal is also a part of the resolution I am submitting today.

There may be those who will object that my proposal goes too far and that some nations, especially the Communist nations, may resist signing it.

To these I would reply that if they

can come up with a milder alternative formula that promises to put an end to the hijacking epidemic, I, for one, will be happy to consider it.

Frankly, I think we will find almost universal support for the stiffening of the Tokyo Convention. And despite the fact that the proposals made in my resolution are directed in the first instance against Cuba, I think the chances are very good that the Soviet Union and most other Communist countries will accept the wisdom of subscribing to the convention.

No Communist passenger liners have yet been hijacked, although quite a number of Communist military planes have been stolen and flown to the West. But air travel is growing by leaps and bounds in the Communist sphere, just as it is in the free world. No one knows better than the Soviet leaders that they have in their countries hundreds of thousands of disaffected citizens who may be thinking of seeking asylum in the West. And if a hijacking epidemic ever got underway in Communist Europe, it might soon make our own epidemic look like small potatoes.

Clearly, the Soviet leaders and other Communist governments in Europe have much to gain from an agreement that would effectively prevent hijacking by guaranteeing the automatic extradition of hijackers. Indeed, they might have more to gain from such an agreement than we have.

I am not insensitive to the fact that some of those who may seek to escape from their homelands or their countries of residence may claim to be political persecutees in quest of asylum.

I yield to no man in the importance I attach to the right of asylum. Indeed, in our age I consider it one of the basic human rights.

However, I do not think that any man has the right to endanger the lives of other people in order to achieve asylum for himself. And as much as I may sympathize with those who desire to escape from Communist oppression, I must say that this fundamental rule applies also to them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my concurrent resolution be left on the table through Friday, February 7, so that other Senators will be able to indicate their support for the proposal by cosponsoring it.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not wish to object—may I ask whether the distinguished Senator has cleared this request with the leadership on the other side of the aisle?

Mr. DODD. No. I did not think it was necessary.

Very well; I withdraw that unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request is withdrawn.

Mr. DODD. I ask unanimous consent, however, that the full text of my concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 7

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), Whereas the past two years have witnessed a growing international epidemic of the hijacking of commercial airplanes, which has endangered the lives of many hundreds of passengers and resulted in serious inconvenience to both passengers and airlines; and

Whereas the epidemic has now reached such proportions in the Western Hemisphere that no passenger on a commercial flight in the Caribbean area can be certain that his flight will not terminate in Havana; and

Whereas the Tokyo Convention on Hijacking, although it represents a first step in the direction of controlling the problem, is, by common consent, inadequate to cope with the situation that exists today;

Therefore be it resolved by the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring) that it is the sense of the Congress that the Administration should move immediately to strengthen the Tokyo Convention by adding clauses to it which (i) call for the automatic extradition of all hijackers to the flag country of the hijacked aircraft, and the immediate release of hijacked aircraft, together with their crews and passengers; and (ii) make it mandatory for the signatory nations to terminate bilateral air transport arrangements with any country that refuses to become a party to the new international convention on hijacking;

And be it further resolved that if the machinery of the International Civil Aviation Organization proves inadequate or too slow moving to bring the epidemic of hijacking under control in the immediate future, it is the sense of the Congress that the government of the United States should seek to deal with the problem through a special international conference, convened on an emergency basis no later than March 31, 1969.

SENATE RESOLUTION 77—RESOLUTION TO REFER SENATE BILL 756 TO THE COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. MUSKIE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 77); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 77

Resolved, That the bill (S. 756) entitled "A bill for the relief of Teresa Lindner", now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims; and the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended by the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 958), and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

SENATE RESOLUTION 78—RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A SELECT COMMITTEE ON TECHNOLOGY AND THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators BAKER, BIBLE, BOGGS, HARRIS, INOUYE, JAVITS, KENNEDY, MCGEE, MONDALE, MOSS, NELSON, PELL, RANDOLPH, TYDINGS, and SCOTT, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution to establish a Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment which would provide a special forum for inquiry into the broad impact of science and technology on man's thinking, health, work, living habits, and his individuality over the next 50 years.

This resolution is an expanded version of Senate Resolution 68, which I introduced in the 90th Congress, and which was reported favorably by the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. President, we are engaged in a scientific and technological revolution which might be described as the single most important happening in the world today.

We have learned more and invented more in the past five generations than in all the previous years going back to the beginning of man. But the prospective acceleration of this learning and invention during the next 50 years defies the imagination.

The vital questions are: Where is the technological revolution leading us? Will man develop the understanding and capability to make it work for a better human environment? Or as William Barrett suggests in his book "Irrational Man," will the human become "subordinated to the machine, even in the traditionally human business of politics"?

As legislators in a democratic society based on belief in maximum individual freedom and human development, we have a responsibility to study the total impact of scientific and technological change on that freedom and development in the years ahead.

We must learn the benefits of the new technology and how they can be applied to public and private planning and investment in resource development, housing, transportation, power supply, education, communication, health, employment, and other aspects of area and community growth.

At the same time, we need to assess the undesirable consequences of technological change, and devise an early-warning system for preventing serious injury to man and his environment.

We must evaluate our governmental institutions at the Federal, State, and local levels, to determine their capability to adapt to this new age of technology.

And we must analyze the impact of technological change on the minds and the value systems of our citizens, to better develop a policy of education designed to encourage them to understand and live within the bounds of a rapidly changing environment.

This changing environment, particularly in the urban areas, will put extraordinary pressures and demands upon our State and local governments in planning, facilities, and services. As a response to these public needs, it is essential that we develop a controlled technological system, capable of producing benefits by design rather than by accident.

To inquire into the broad impact and implications of science and technology on man and his environment, and to plan now for the future would be the respon-

sibility of the select committee I propose today.

Mr. President, this would be a study committee where scientists and legislators can gather to discuss the gravity of environmental problems to be faced and what science and technology can do to solve these problems in cooperation with the Federal, State, and local governments.

It is not the intent of this resolution to establish a committee which would infringe in any way upon the existing substantive jurisdictions of the standing committees. The select committee would have no jurisdiction over legislation or powers of legislative oversight. Rather, its purpose would be to provide a source of information and analysis not now available in the Senate—necessary information cutting across the environmental spectrum, and which the standing committees do not have the time or the mandate to develop for themselves.

Standing committees are increasingly burdened with legislative proposals within their special fields, together with the responsibility of overseeing the effectiveness of on-going programs and the expenditure of funds. The staffs of these committees are pressed with the necessary duties of developing legislative hearings, drafting legislation, analyzing proposals, and investigating facts related to their committee functions, and thus have little opportunity to explore the broader issues of science and technology.

The hearings developed by the select committee, as proposed here, would provide individual Senators, their legislative assistants, and committee staff members, with a wealth of factual and analytical material which could be used in developing new ideas for legislative and executive policy, and in assessing the problems ahead as they may affect their States, localities, and functional interests.

The real strength of the proposed select committee lies in the composition of its membership. It would be composed of three members from each of the standing committees most concerned with the individual and his environment:

Agriculture—Responsible for agricultural and forestry research, production and marketing, soil conservation, agricultural education, extension of farm credit and security, and improvement of rural areas;

Banking and Currency—With responsibility in housing, urban development, private investment, and financial aid to commerce and industry;

Commerce—With major interests in transportation, oceanography, weather science, marine resources, communication, and economic development;

Interior and Insular Affairs—Handing public land development, recreation, irrigation, conservation, and development of natural resources;

Labor and Public Welfare—Primarily responsible for health, education, welfare, and employment opportunities;

Public Works—Concerned with building roads and public facilities, water and air pollution, economic development, waterpower, and other public improvements; and

Government Operations—Which has general oversight responsibility on the efficiency and economy of the Federal Government and has several subcommittees, including its Subcommittee on Research, which have been directly involved in investigations of environmental matters.

Thus, the standing committees most involved with legislation affecting human needs would participate directly in determining those areas for inquiry which they felt were most relevant to their needs. It would be in a position to guide the select committee's efforts along lines which would assure maximum benefit to the standing committees. Further, the close relationship which would be developed between the select committee staff and the staffs of the represented standing committees would provide an invaluable interchange of information and expertise.

In addition to its service to the Senate, the select committee would, through its hearings and reports, make an immeasurable contribution to Congress as a whole, to the executive branch, to academic institutions and scholars, to professional organizations, to State and local governments and to the public at large.

It should be emphasized that the proposed select committee would not have permanent status. Its authority is specifically terminated January 31, 1972. During its tenure, it is expected to issue interim reports and hold numerous hearings to which will be invited the Nation's most respected and experienced scholars in the physical and social sciences, in the application of technology to human needs, and in the fields of government—Federal, State and local. Before its termination, it must render a final report, which could provide a meaningful base for the development of national goals for the environmental betterment of man, not only in America, but throughout the world.

Mr. President, the challenge we face concerning technology and the human environment warrants that this select committee be established as soon as possible to come to grips with it, and inform the Congress of its magnitude and effect on the lives of our citizens.

As a background for the understanding and development of this legislation in the 91st Congress, I feel that it would be helpful for my colleagues to have for their information a special staff report prepared for the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations highlighting some of the testimony and materials obtained during the course of our hearings on Senate Resolution 68 in the 90th Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that this report be printed at this point in the RECORD, and following the report, the text of the Senate resolution to establish a Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the resolution and report will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 78) was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

S. RES. 78

Whereas man's ability to alter and control his environment through the use of new technology is increasing at an accelerating rate, bringing new problems as well as benefits; and

Whereas in the next fifty years, technological change will require a greater use of and have a substantial impact on the natural and human resources of the Nation; and

Whereas it is essential to the continued welfare of the United States that appropriate public and private planning and investment in resource development, transportation, housing, education, communications, community development, water resources (including oceanography), power supplies, technology, automation, and public works to be made to improve the quality of man's environment; and

Whereas the Senate, in order to evaluate properly the probable needs for public and private investment in these areas over the next fifty years, should have recommendations and information relative to needed programs and their character, extent, and timing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That (a) there is hereby established a select committee of the Senate to be known as the Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment (hereinafter referred to as the "Committee") consisting of twenty-one Members of the Senate to be designated by the President of the Senate, as follows:

(1) three from among Senators who are members of the Committee on Agriculture;

(2) three from among Senators who are members of the Committee on Banking and Currency;

(3) three from among Senators who are members of the Committee on Commerce;

(4) three from among Senators who are members of the Committee on Government Operations;

(5) three from among Senators who are members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs;

(6) three from among Senators who are members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and

(7) three from among Senators who are members of the Committee on Public Works.

At least one such Senator appointed from each such committee shall be a member of the minority party. The Committee shall select by majority vote of the members thereof a chairman from among such members.

(b) Vacancies in the membership of the Committee shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to execute the functions of the Committee. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments are made.

(c) A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of business, except that the Committee may fix a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony. The Committee shall adopt rules of procedure not inconsistent with the rules of the Senate governing standing committees of the Senate.

(d) No legislative measure shall be referred to the Committee, and it shall have no authority to report any such measure to the Senate.

(e) The Committee shall cease to exist on January 31, 1973.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the Committee to conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of—

(1) the character and extent of technological changes that probably will occur and which should be promoted within the next fifty years and their effect on population, communities, and industry, including but not limited to the need for public and private planning and investment in housing, water resources (including oceanography), education, automation affecting interstate

commerce, communications, transportation, power supplies, welfare, and other community services and facilities; and

(2) policies that would encourage the maximum private investment in means of improving the human environment, for the purpose of making the recommendations of the Committee and the results of such study and investigation available to the Senate and the committees thereof in considering policies for public investment and encouraging private investment.

(b) On or before January 31, 1973, the Committee shall submit to the Senate for reference to the appropriate standing committees a final report of its study and investigation together with its recommendations. The Committee may make such interim reports to the appropriate standing committees of the Senate prior to such final report as it deems advisable.

SEC. 3. (a) For the purposes of this resolution, the Committee is authorized to (1) make such expenditures; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony orally or by deposition; and (7) employ and fix the compensation of such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable, except that the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, for comparable duties.

(b) Upon request made by the members of the Committee selected from the minority party, the Committee shall appoint one assistant or consultant designated by such members. No assistant or consultant appointed by the Committee may receive compensation at an annual gross rate which exceeds by more than $2,400 the annual gross rate of compensation of any individual so designated by the minority members of the Committee.

(c) With the prior consent of the department or agency concerned, the Committee may (1) utilize the services, information, and facilities of the General Accounting Office or any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government, and (2) employ on a reimbursable basis or otherwise the services of such personnel of any such department or agency as it deems advisable. With the consent of any other committee of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, the Committee may utilize the facilities and the services of the staff of such other committee or subcommittee whenever the chairman of the Committee determines that such action is necessary and appropriate.

(d) Subpenas may be issued by the Committee over the signature of the chairman or any other member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the Committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the Committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed — — shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee.

The report presented by Mr. MUSKIE is as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON TECHNOLOGY AND THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT: A STAFF MEMORANDUM PREPARED FOR THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

BACKGROUND

The proposal for a Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment was first introduced by Senator Edmund S. Muskie in the 89th Congress, 2nd Session as S. Res. 298. It was reintroduced by Senator Muskie on January 25, 1967, as S. Res. 68, with 21 cosponsors.

The Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, to which the legislation was referred, held seven days of hearings during which the Subcommittee obtained testimony and statements from some thirty witnesses representing a wide scope of scientific, technological, and political experience and concern in the area of human environment. There was unanimous support for the general purpose of the resolution.

On June 28, 1967, the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations reported S. Res. 68 favorably, with amendments, to the full Committee for appropriate action. Although on the full Committee agenda, consideration of the legislation was not completed during the 90th Congress.

PURPOSE AND DESCRIPTION OF THE SENATE RESOLUTION 68

The resolution expressed the Senate's concern over man's ability to alter and control his environment in the light of accelerating technological change during the next 50 years. It considered it essential to the continued welfare of the United States that we understand the impact of this change on our natural and human resources so that we can anticipate our needs and problems, and properly develop policies for public and private planning that will improve the quality of man's environment.

Under the resolution, the Select Committee was authorized to conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of (1) the character and extent of technological changes that probably will occur and which should be promoted within the next fifty years and their effect on population, communities, and industry; and (2) policies which would encourage the maximum private investment in means of improving the human environment.

The resolution further required that on or before January 31, 1971, the Select Committee should submit to the Senate for reference to appropriate legislative committees a final report of its study and investigation together with its recommendations, and that it should make such interim reports to the appropriate legislative committees of the Senate prior to such final report as it deemed advisable.

The Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment would be composed of eighteen members of the Senate to be designated by the President of the Senate, with three members each from the following standing committees; Agriculture; Banking and Currency; Commerce; Interior and Insular Affairs; Labor and Public Welfare; and Public Works. At least one Senator appointed from each such committee would be a member of the minority party.

The Subcommittee staff recommends, in the light of discussions held during full committee consideration, that the Committee on Government Operations be added to the list of committees represented. Its general oversight function into the efficiency and economy of Federal government operations has brought it directly into areas of research and development, Federal assistance to States, localities, and individuals, and Federal organization and management policies having a substantial effect on environmental development.

For carrying out the purposes set forth in the resolution, the select committee would be empowered to make expenditures, hold hearings, require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents, administer oaths, take testimony orally or by deposition, and employ such technical clerical and other assistance as it deemed advisable. In addition, it would be permitted to utilize the services and facilities of the General Accounting Office, of agencies of the Executive Branch, and of the staff of other committees and subcommittees of the Senate. It is further provided that the rules of procedure of such committee shall not be inconsistent with the rules of the Senate governing its standing committees.

The resolution specifically provides that no legislative measure shall be referred to the select committee and that it shall have no authority to report any such measure to the Senate.

Finally, the proposed select committee would be temporary in nature, its authority terminating under S. Res. 68 on January 31, 1971. This termination date would, of course, have to be updated depending on a final action on the legislation. However, it was the Subcommittee's intention that the Select Committee should have at least a three-year period in which to make its study and demonstrate its importance to the Senate.

In fact, there was discussion among Subcommittee members that during this three-year period, the House of Representatives might express a desire to expand the Select Committee into a Joint Committee on Technology and the Human Environment.

HEARINGS ON SENATE RESOLUTION 298

As previously mentioned, hearings on S. Res. 298 were held on December 15, 1966. Witnesses at these hearings were S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary, Smithsonian Institution; Dr. James Shannon, Director, National Institutes of Health; and Professor Roger Revelle, Director, Center for Population Studies, Harvard University.

Dr. Ripley suggested that the interaction of technology and the human environment may become "the sovereign issue of our time", but he warned that too often we see advancing technology in only one dimension—"that in which change is most apparent, as in increasing speed, increasing the output of land, or increasing the supply of energy." He saw the Select Committee as an "excellent" mechanism for studying the "other dimensions and countless effects" of technological change, and for bringing together a variety of disparate fields of scientific and technological information with "man as a central factor."

Dr. Shannon was more concerned with the increasing variety of hazards developing from advancing technology.

"Accidents now rate as the major cause of death from the first year of life to age 36.

"The increasing dispersal of toxic chemicals and other substances of largely unassessed biological effect in air, water, and food engenders mounting public apprehension.

"The expanding use and diversity of sources of ionizing radiation threatens widespread biological damage.

"The complexity of industrial development and activity, and urban living with consequent growth in noise, strain, speed, tension, and social instability, pose grave psychogenic potentials."

He saw these problems "among the most urgent and formidable of contemporary issues," but like Dr. Ripley, he was also concerned that too often the Congress and the Executive Branch have approached them on an individual basis. "The holistic approach has been missing", he said, "and the result has been widespread fragmentation of responsibilities. This way of doing business has diffused the Federal discharge of responsibilities; it has tended to confuse State and local relationships to these Federal efforts." For this reason he was "inclined favorably" to the comprehensive concept of the proposed Select Committee.

Professor Revelle agreed with Dr. Shannon that "we live in a world of such rapid change and are beset by so many perils and instabilities, largely created by our own actions, that thoughtful men everywhere are trying to pierce the curtain of the future

with an anxiety and intensity that did not exist in past generations."

"Attempts to plan the future, at least a few years ahead, are characteristic of most modern governments", he said, "and a new science of technical forecasting is rapidly developing in our universities and research institutions." However, he went on to observe that "the rhythms and traditions of politics in the United States are such that our governmental agencies have had very little interest in, or capability for, making long-range plans based on valid technological forecasts," and thus "it is of the utmost importance that the Congress should take a pioneering lead in this direction."

"Very few of the great problems of the real world," said the renowned Harvard scientist, "can be solved within one discipline. They have to be solved by many disciplines working together." He saw the proposed Select Committee as a means of bringing the knowledge of these disciplines into a meaningful balance, and providing the Government with a forum for thinking about them "over longer time horizons".

HEARINGS ON SENATE RESOLUTION 68

Hearings on S. Res. 68 were conducted in three phases: eminent scientists, educators and government scholars; spokesmen from Federal agencies involved in environmental development; and interested Senators. On behalf of the Committee, Senator Muskie invited the chairmen and ranking minority members of the various standing committees which would be represented on the Select Committee (or other members as designated by them) to participate with the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations in developing the record.

First phase

The first phase of the hearings on S. Res. 68 was held on March 15, 16 and 20, 1967. Those testifying were: Dr. Donald F. Hornig, Special Advisor to the President for Science and Technology, and Director, Office of Science and Technology; Dr. Joseph L. Fisher, President, Resources for the Future, Inc.; Dr. Detlev Bronk, President, Rockefeller University; Dr. Howard R. Bowen, President, University of Iowa; Dr. Harrison Brown, Head of Division of Geological Sciences, California Institute of Technology; Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission; Mr. Jack T. Conway, Executive Director, Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO; Dr. Donald N. Michael, Professor of Psychology, the University of Michigan; and Dr. John T. Wilson, Deputy Director of the National Science Foundation.

Each of these witnesses indicated a general endorsement of the resolution, and felt that such a Select Committee would be of assistance to the Senate, and to academic, governmental, professional and other institutions seeking to forecast the future impact of technological development on man.

Dr. Hornig saw the interaction between advancing technology and society as a problem rooted in history. "What is new," he said, "is the scale, the variety, and the speed of change, both in man's physical and his social environment."

Dr. Hornig said that we have "not mastered the problems of production," and unless we sustain or increase the growth of our per capital gross national product, and improve the distribution of that product, we will be unable to find the resources necessary to: maintain security; overcome poverty at home; improve our environment; and reduce the gap between rich and poor countries in the world.

But this is a "deadly serious game of tightrope walking," he said. As we "sustain rapid economic growth," we must also attempt to "foresee the consequences of major changes to protect ourselves from unintended secondary efforts." He cited pesticides as a well known example, along with the congestion of ground transportation around a heavily used airport, and the noise from aircraft.

Dr. Hornig said that "technological change and its consequences must be incorporated in our planning, in our budget—personal, corporate and governmental." He said that better means must be found for harmonizing continued technological development, rising incomes, rapid expansion of urban population, with the most appropriate long-term use of our environment.

"This is why I think it is very important that there be in Congress a forum for discussing the overall problems, and not just the problems as defined by the structures of Congressional committees," he said.

Dr. Detlev Bronk, drawing from his distinguished career as a scientist and educator, also emphasized the importance of an agency in Congress to consider the "interrelatedness" of the technical and political forces which determine the nature of our rapidly changing environment.

Commenting on Senator Muskie's opening remarks, he told the Subcommittee: "Science is on every ballot. Science and Technology are obvious or hidden in every bill. They sit in the Governor's chair every day. And so when you say, 'each day we are asked to make decisions on legislation which may have profound implications in the years ahead', I say, I agree completely. And you go on to say a significant thing: 'our environment cannot be neatly divided into simple components'. Those two statements, I think, are complete justification for a Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment that will foster a recognition of the interrelationship of the many bills that will have to be considered in the years ahead."

The testimony of three witnesses, Drs. Fisher, Brown and Seaborg, joined by the written statement of Dr. Alvin M. Weinberg, Director of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, dramatized the tremendous benefits, but yet complications, of a "high-energy civilization", predicted for the year 2000 and beyond. But that time, with our present rate of development, more than half our electrical power capacity could come from nuclear energy, notably the "breeder reactor" and even more advanced energy techniques, but there would also be an expansion in conventional power sources as well.

The impact of trillions of kilowatt hours of low-cost electricity spread across our nation by massive interconnecting power grids could "revolutionize" nearly every facet of American living and economic development, according to these witnesses. These witnesses said that Congress must not continue to think of the development of electrical energy as a function apart from the total development of the individual and his environment, and that it should be the role of a Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment to put this total impact into a meaningful perspective in line with national goals.

Dr. Brown and Dr. Seaborg see this "high-energy civilization" coming on us before we may be ready to cope with it. They picture "self-contained cities" where we could learn to live in a closed system much like that in which the astronaut finds himself in space. The use of large amounts of cheap energy would allow us to desalt sea and brackish water economically, recycle water from sewage and industrial waste, provide clean water for agriculture and city use, and develop dynamic new methods for extracting raw materials.

Dr. Seaborg described the industrial complex of the future, powered by atomic energy and run by automation:

"Into [some] plants would pour all sorts of scrap from the outside world. This scrap would pass X-ray fluorescence analysis and automated examinations. On the basis of these, its materials would be broken down, sorted, electrolytically or electromagnetically separated, and the end products—essentially new raw materials—routed out to other plants in the complex to be reused. At the same time these other plants would also be receiving raw materials from other sources.

"What would these plants be producing? They would be taking in ilmenite, bauxite and clay and turning out aluminum. They would be using large amounts of hydrocarbons (no longer necessary as fuels) and in huge chlorination works producing solvents, insecticides, plastics and many other materials for industry and agriculture. They would be producing great supplies of nitrogen and phosphate for much-needed fertilizers. They would be making steel by hydrogen reduction, and in large electric furnaces would be turning phosphates, silica, lime and salts into glass, ceramics and ceramic fiber-reinforced alloys. Through electrolysis these plants would also produce caustic soda and magnesium—the latter possibly having been extracted from seawater desalted by the dual-purpose nuclear reactor.

"In addition to these, other plants might be associated with the reactor facilities which would allow the production of many essentially new materials—a variety of polymers, special high-temperature metals, new alloys and perhaps large quantities of transuranium elements. Some of these transuranium elements would provide new nuclear fuel—fuel which would operate equipment ranging from reactors in space to artificial hearts implanted in men.

". . . Underground arteries, conveyor belts and pipelines would replace mazes of roads and rails. And no forests of chimneys would fill the horizon, nor would any harmful pollution fill the atmosphere."

We have not established within the United States, said Dr. Harrison Brown, "institutions where people are charged with the responsibility of really thinking about these problems. . . . We experiment with almost everything in the way of industrial growth, in the way of military equipment, in the way of large energy plants, but as the single most important machine—the city, a very complex machine—we do almost no experimentation at all."

Dr. Brown suggests, for consideration by the Select Committee, that a scientific, experimental city be built to work on the problems of pollution, waste disposal, transportation, residential planning, and efficiency in size and comfort. "We can transform our own country . . . we have the technological knowledge . . . if we but agreed that we are going to do it," he said, "but the problem is to agree that we are going to do it."

Nuclear energy, and all that one can see flowing from it, constitutes a massive "technological fix" which Dr. Weinberg sees as reducing immensely complicated social questions, with the combined imagination and creativity of social and technological engineers. But he says "we have few institutions that can develop coherent social doctrines and technical components—that are at the root of modern social problems. He suggested that a Select Committee could well give serious attention to recommending National Socio-Technological Institutes which would be laboratories concerned with the city, with crime, race relations, pollution, housing, and other leading environmental problems.

Drs. Bowen and Michael also expressed a concern that we were not developing fast enough the social and political technology to catch up with the "hardware technology."

Dr. Bowen testified:

"One of our difficulties is that we approach the problems piecemeal, without proper regard for their interrelatedness. In the intellectual arena, we divide our learning into narrow disciplines and subspecialties with inadequate machinery for multidisciplinary communication and cooperation. In the political arena, at any level of government, we divide our efforts among specialized agen-

cies and committees which consider problems in specific areas without due regard for broad environmental and human objectives. Often these agencies work at cross-purposes. And the multiplicity of units of government, especially at the local level, defeats many of our best efforts because we deal with problems for geographic areas that are not commensurate with the scope of the problems. Many solutions are defeated also by vested interests or by the sheer inertia of tradition.

"When we do gear up to solve a problem, resolutely and appropriately, as we did in the case of nuclear energy or space exploration, we can accomplish marvels. But there is no reason to doubt that problems like housing or transportation or development of marine resources would be amenable to solution by the techniques that have been so spectacularly successful with nuclear energy and space exploration—if resolute decisions backed up by adequate resources were made."

He suggested the Select Committee consider a system of national accounting to measure the magnitude of social benefits and social costs involved in national programs. He said that our present system for measuring the gross national product, national income, and related magnitudes, although highly useful, is nevertheless based on values expressed in the market place. He felt that this system of accounting has "many limitations as a measure of our performance in terms of human welfare."

Second, he proposed for such committee consideration the development of a "systems analysis" approach for use by Federal, State, and local governments in meeting their human and environmental problems. Such an approach would be similar to that which has been so successful in the development of weaponry and space technology. "We should be seeking a transport system in which all the various means of transportation would play their part as a coordinated system," he said. "The systems approach could be applicable to such areas as community development, juvenile delinquency, abatement of pollution, even race relations."

Finally, he sees the great need for a continuing national body to recommend national goals, evaluate national performance, observe social changes, forecast possible trends, and suggest policy alternatives for democratic decision-making. "I would be pleased indeed if a Select Committee of the Senate were established for this purpose," he said.

Dr. Michael, a Professor of Psychology at the University of Michigan, and Director of the Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, told the Subcommittee that the social sciences and engineering are "data poor" with respect to forecasting the future impact of technology on human environment, just as the physical technologists are "much poorer comparatively when it comes to predicting the social consequences of their own hardware." He suggested that a Select Committee, as proposed in S. Res. 68, could make a contribution by recommending the kind of data to be collected systematically in the years ahead, and to "raise questions about value preferences."

What we need, said Dr. Michael, is a far greater development of the "social engineering" as compared with the "hardware technology", to influence the nature of plans for such major tasks as urban development, water supply, mass transit or educational systems. Social engineers are in short supply today, he said. Thus a vital goal should be to develop an educational system to prepare the social planners and administrators for effective use of the physical technology which is so rapidly developing.

"To live in tomorrow's world," said Dr. Michael, "requires a kind of education—for wisdom, for compassion, for insight, for empathy, for appreciating the difference between manipulating people and being open and trusting."

Mr. Jack Conway, speaking from his extensive experience in the area of poverty, manpower development and training and economic development, expressed a particular concern over the impact of technological change on the working man, and his community life. "Today's problems, while important to us, are going to be minor compared to tomorrow's problems unless we can anticipate what they are."

He suggested we have reached a point where we have got to think about maintaining income for those who can't work. We have to know what kind and what amount of jobs are going to exist in the future. We have to think about a new structure of educational systems and the increasing length of time that people may attend school free of charge. We have to think more about how individuals can make productive use of leisure time. Finally, we have to develop a better method of comprehensive community planning.

"It is difficult, almost impossible, to get out ahead and treat in an orderly fashion the mass of information available. . . . the creation of this Select Committee, which would provide this kind of service to the (substantive) committee would be a major step forward," he said.

The second phase

The second phase of the hearings on S. Res. 68 took place on April 5 and 6, 1967, and involved the testimony of Federal government officials. They were Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; Dr. George W. Irving, Jr., Administrator, Agricultural Research Service, Department of Agriculture; Honorable Lee C. White, Chairman, Federal Power Commission; Honorable Alan S. Boyd, Secretary of Transportation, accompanied by Richard Copaken, White House fellow; Honorable Philip R. Lee, Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, accompanied by William Stewart, Surgeon General, Public Health Service; and Honorable Stanley H. Ruttenberg, Assistant Secretary for Manpower, Department of Labor.

Although careful to suggest that the creation of a Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment was primarily a Senate matter, the witnesses generally supported the objectives of the resolution.

Secretary Udall was initially concerned with the "great damage" already done to man's environment by what he termed the "unbalance of science and technology." "We urgently need more basic facts," he said, "we need to be able to predict consequences—we need an early warning system for environmental protection."

He cited examples of "single-minded" industrial progress where we failed to anticipate the side effects: home detergents that polluted our streams, the high-powered automobile polluting the air, the accumulation of solid wastes, acid water drainage from mines, pesticide residues, and thermal pollution of our rivers from electric power production.

He said the 120,000 ton *Torrey Canyon* which spilled its cargo of oil along the beaches of Southern England, should be a warning to everyone.

"The thing they are trying to do is build a larger and larger tanker, and of course this is a technological advance that is welcome. It enables us to do our transportation cheaper, but we haven't asked ourselves the other questions—our preparedness in the event an accident occurs. I can tell you there was a lot of scurrying around in this city when the disaster occurred—how we could help the British rescue themselves. We weren't ready, and they weren't ready. There was no answer ready."

The Secretary stated that the resolution to establish a Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment was both "welcome and timely" because it emphasizes the "total environment approach" to identifying problems and seeking solutions.

According to Dr. Irving, of the Agricultural Research Service, the major technological concern in his field—as with the Secretary of the Interior—is environmental pollution—from the air, water, radioactive materials, industrial wastes, mine drainage, pesticides and trash. But USDA research is doubling its efforts to do something about these things, he said.

To meet pest infestation, USDA is involved in studies of "insect sterility and diseases, attractants, predators and parasites of insects and weeds, and the use of sound, light and radiant energy," to replace harmful chemicals.

It is also developing ways of controlling saline soils and water, the conversion of hard-to-dispose-of agricultural waste products, the elimination of animal diseases.

But a most significant part of the Irving testimony centered on a vital issue that recurred a number of times throughout our hearings, that of the practicalities of reversing the population trend from the rural areas to the cities, where it is estimated that by the year 2000, 90 percent of our population will be crowded into 9 percent of our land space.

Senator Mundt put the problem in perspective:

"It seems to me a rather shortsighted policy to concentrate solely on trying to find methods of solving the problems in the big cities without doing something to keep the problems from continually getting larger, if it is possible . . .

"If the influx of population from rural America keeps pouring in—that's where the economic opportunity is, the educational opportunities, cultural opportunities—progress toward a solution doesn't seem to make such headway. You are walking on a treadmill . . .

". . . I wonder . . . what steps might be taken by the Federal Government or State governments, or by the local governments in order to diminish the acceleration of this trend from the country and smaller communities to our larger American cities . . . I think this is a genuine problem. Were it not so, we would not be talking about these multibillion-dollar appropriations for the problems of the big city . . ."

Representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare gave specific endorsement to the creation of the Select Committee relative to their own needs for the coordination of information in the environmental field:

Philip R. Lee stated:

". . . we need, . . . in the Congress, a committee which can be oriented to public policy problems and possibilities of the near and far future. So often now, decisions are based on today's needs, in reference to an immediate legislative problem, frequently considered to be narrow in scope, even though it may have implications in other fields far into the future . . . . We need a committee which can be so constructed as to look at public policy questions as broadly as possible, unlimited by traditional jurisdictions; we need a committee which can serve as a central point where all the diverse information in a host of interrelated fields can be collected, analyzed, integrated, and made available in logical form to the Government and the public. Today there is no such focal point in either the Congress or the Executive Branch, and I should add that one effort on the part of the Executive Branch, the Federal Council for Science and Technology, although it serves some useful purposes, clearly is not constituted to achieve this kind of broad objective."

Dr. William Stewart stated:

". . . It would be of value to us (the medical world) to have the benefit of the foresight and guidance of a committee whose task it was to study the changing impact of technology on the environment, to forewarn us of problems just over the horizon, and to counsel us in reaching the decisions that are of critical importance to health, and to hear our concerns which lie outside the province of existing committee assignments."

A special report was submitted in June of 1967 to the Secretary of HEW on the broad problems of environmental pollution—water, air, urban noise and crowding, product hazards, and future planning for identifying the dangers to come. This report was by a special task force, headed by Ron M. Linton, and sponsored by HEW. It made 34 recommendations, 10 of which were described as immediate "action goals" which cut across virtually all phases of man's living environment. The work of this task force would be of substantial value to the study contemplated by the proposed Select Committee.

Chairman Lee C. White indicated his opinion of the important role that the Select Committee could play by saying:

". . . The special advantage of the proposed Select Committee would be its ability to illuminate new and unexpected relationships between technological advance and human environment, without being limited by lines of committee jurisdictions or the bounds of a particular item of proposed legislation. Such a committee can follow any clue to the relationship between science and society which it believes to be important. We need studies of this type every bit as much as we need detailed examination of particular problems."

Secretary Alan Boyd said that in this last half of the twentieth century, "we are suffering from an embarrassment of technological riches," but that "the side effects of technology are creating new problems for society along with the new opportunities." He agreed we must find a way to anticipate and control these effects in order to achieve an environmental "net gain."

"Transportation technology," he said, "can no longer be viewed in isolation, either among modes themselves or in the total environment. Transportation is a subsystem within a larger set of social, economic and political goals, and this subsystem must be designed and developed with a clear understanding of these goals."

He said that he felt the object of S. Res. 68—which would be concerned with the total technological impact—was "worthy of the highest consideration."

Finally, Assistant Secretary Ruttenberg stated that the proposal for a Select Committee "reflects a growing nation-wide concern for the condition of our human environment . . . a more rational ordering of information so that governments at all levels can be better equipped to deal with the environmental implications of science and technology. "This forum," he said, "should be one where there would be no hesitation to propound a problem for which no solution was offered, and where solutions could seek problems.

"Science has provided the problem-solving techniques," said the Assistant Secretary, "whether we have the will to use this knowledge purposefully and effectively in solving the human problems arising from technology is our challenge."

The third phase

During the final phase of hearings, held April 11, eight Senators gave their views as to the merits of the S. Res. 68: Senators Baker (Tennessee), Inouye (Hawaii), Javits (New York), Mondale (Minnesota), Moss (Utah), Nelson (Wisconsin), Pell (Rhode Island), and Randolph (West Virginia).

All Senators gave unqualified support to the establishment of a Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment. The following is a summary of some of the general points they made:

(1) the need to develop in the Senate a central source of information as to the existing benefits and hazards of technology and what can be expected in the next fifty years;

(2) the need to have a unit—politically and socially oriented—to make an assessment of this information and devise a method for early warning of undesirable consequences, together with recommendations for prevention;

(3) the need to develop a meaningful policy for coordinating the benefits of technology to solve the problems of increasing urbanization and decreasing rural developments;

(4) the need to develop a comprehensive approach toward education on a continuing basis to prepare all of our citizens for life in the atomic and computer age;

(5) the need to put science and technology to work on a coordinated basis to conserve our natural resources, to develop new resources and to provide cheaper and safer materials for the basic needs of our citizens;

(6) the need to bring scientists and legislators closer together to develop a mutual understanding of the future of technology in line with national goals of environmental development;

(7) the need to understand fully what the anticipated "high-energy civilization" of the future will mean for our citizens in their total environment;

(8) the need to explore the best methods of preserving the rights, individual dignity and mental stability of every individual and his family in a complex technological world;

(9) the need to assess the advanced techniques of information retrieval systems, analysis, programming, and planning successfully used by the military and space discipline, for application in solving environmental problems;

(10) the need to bring together the standing committees most involved in developing national policy for improving the individual and his environment to weigh the implications of scientific and technological advance on a total basis, and to develop long-range goals for America as it moves into the twenty-first century.

The statement of Senator Nelson set forth some particularly thought-provoking questions which would be relevant to the Select Committee's investigation. He asked:

"Why cannot the same specialist who can figure out a way to put a man in space figure out a way to keep him out of jail?

"Why cannot the engineers who can move a rocket to Mars figure out a way to move people through our cities and across the country without the problems of modern traffic and the concrete desert of our highway system?

"Why cannot the scientists who can cleanse instruments to spend germ-free years in space devise a method to end the present pollution of air and water here on earth?

"Why cannot highly trained manpower, which can calculate a way to transmit pictures for millions of miles in space, also show us a way to transmit enough simple information to keep track of our criminals?

"Why cannot we use computers to deal with the down to earth special problems of modern America?

"Can we estimate the cost of various possible approaches—or mixes of approaches—and use computers to figure out the most efficient and economical way to do a job? In other words, can we get some idea of the cost-effectiveness of a variety of social programs?

"The answer is we can—if we have the wit to apply our scientific know-how to the analysis and solution of social problems with the same creativity we have applied it to space problems.

"We must test new ways to use the scientific manpower and know-how of the space age to solve a great variety of social problems."

Finally, Subcommittee Chairman Muskie and Senator Baker put the need for such a study unit on technology in a special perspective during their remarks on the legislation.

Senator Muskie stated:

"We are well along with our scientific and technological planning and programming, our systems management, our cybernetic progress, in the military and defense sectors, and in our efforts to put a man on the moon. But what does the next fifty years of science and technology hold for man on the earth in terms of health, education, employment, housing and transportation, and community development? How can science and technology be applied to meet these human needs, and what problems will man face in adapting to our developing technological world? Where, indeed, are we heading? Will man's environment be what he wants it to be, or what science and technology determine it to be? How can we be assured that the new technology will be used for the progressive improvement of the conditions of our common life? These are some of the issues that a Select Committee could well explore. . . .

"The particular merit and strength of this proposal lies in the varied membership of such a committee. It would be composed of three members of each of the standing committees . . . most involved with legislation affecting human needs. They would have direct participation in this comprehensive inquiry.

"The permanent committees in the past have been virtually inundated by legislative proposals. Little or no time has been available for them to collect or evaluate information on the future nature of our environment. What I am proposing is a means of alleviating the pressures of time on those committees to assure that the needed information will not be overlooked."

Senator Baker expressed similar views in support of the proposed Senate Select Committee, which he said should provide a "clearinghouse" of information for those responsible for making political and economic decisions. He said:

"I think the primary distinction between this era and those that have preceded us in the development of this Republic is that the pace and velocity of technological development, and the pace and velocity of new sociological problems are such that the lead time, so to speak, between the emergency of the problem and the formulation of the palliative, or the discovery of the solution, is greatly diminished.

"I think we can no longer afford the luxury of waiting for the full-blown problem to present itself for the consideration of the national Congress. But rather, now in this age, both from the technological standpoint, we owe the additional, and substantially more difficult obligation, of anticipating, and trying to predict, the nature and the dimensions and the quality of the problems. . . ."

Increasing national and and international concern with the problem of technology and the human environment

The concept of a central study group in the Senate to look at the total impact of advancing technology on our environmental development is consistent with a growing national and international concern over man's future in the atomic age.

This concern has been heightened by the acceleration of scientific knowledge and technological invention growing out of our military and space research and development, spurred on by advancing computer techniques and closer informational ties between scientists throughout the world.

The subject is presently being investigated by a growing number of institutions and scholars, and these resources could be of substantial assistance to the staff of the Select Committee.

For example, from a grant by the Carnegie Foundation, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences is sponsoring a *Commission on the Year 2000*, headed by the noted sociologist Daniel Bell. The Commission is studying methods of predicting ecological change from scientific advancement, which looks toward a "post-industrial society"—one in which the economy has moved from being predominantly engaged in the production of goods to be preoccupied with services, research, the creative use of leisure time, and the comfort and convenience of living.

Harvard University has established a special *Program on Technology and Society*, directed by Emmanuel G. Mesthene, to enquire "into the effects of rapid technological change on the economy, on public policies, and on the character of the society, as well as the reciprocal effect of social change on the directions of scientific and technological developments." This is a ten-year program, funded by the International Business Machines Corporation. It draws on a combined faculty committee from Harvard's Graduate Schools of Public Administration, Business Administration, Education, and Arts and Sciences, including the Division of Engineering and Applied Physics.

Columbia University has established an *Institute for the Study of Science in Human Affairs* through a grant from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. The aim of the Institute is "to help man understand more fully the scientific forces that shape his life and to make better informed decisions on what the proper direction of scientific and technological developments should be."

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, located in Paris has embarked on a most ambitious program of technological forecasting. Its Committee on Science Policy has issued a series of reports and initiated conferences dealing with global and regional energy potentials, including nuclear energy, with assumed aggregated rates of technological change and the social and economic implications of automation. A recent OECD document entitled "Technological Forecasting in Perspective" contains an elaborate list of interdisciplinary activities in the United States and abroad with respect to developing the social technology of the future.

The International Biological Program (*IBP*), established in 1964 and coordinating the work of 40 nations is directed to measuring the adaptability of man of varying backgrounds to new environments. Its studies will include environmental stresses, such as tolerances to heat, cold, noise, high altitudes, and nutritional stresses; the adaptive processes with respect to disease; the biological consequences of human activity, the study of physical growth, aging and death, and human adaptability planning for for the future.

The National Academy of Sciences is continuing pertinent studies through its Committee on Science and Public Policy. A report "Applied Science and Technological Progress" was made to the House Committee on Science and Astronautics in June 1967.

The National Academy of Engineering has established an Environmental Studies Board with a grant from the Kellogg Foundation. A Committee on Public Engineering Policy also has been formed.

The Hudson Institute has issued a report forecasting the appearance of very probable technical innovations by the year 2000.

The Institute for the Future has been established at Wesleyan University with initial funding from the Ford Foundation and the Connecticut Research Commission. The Institute will seek to organize systematic and comprehensive studies of the long-range future.

George Washington University has established a Program of Policy Studies which includes analysis of the impact of technology on society.

Other private sector programs include those at the Tempo Center for Advanced Studies of the General Electric Company and the Stanford Research Institute.

Popular interest in the impact of science on man's future on earth has been stimulated by a series of television broadcasts entitled the "Twenty-first Century" produced by CBS News and sponsored by the Union Carbide Corporation. These programs covered a number of future projections from atomic power to the creative use of leisure time. Because they represent the type of issues of interest to a Select Committee as proposed, the verbatim transcripts of these television programs have been printed in the appendix to the hearings on S. Res. 68.

A number of significant developments are taking place to cope with the "technology gap" with respect to social and economic development under the auspices and incentive of our American government.

The Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives has a *Panel on Science and Technology*, which in 1966 held a three-day symposium on the topic of "Government, Science, and Public Policy," directed to seeking ways in which scientific and technological knowledge could eradicate many of the problems facing our modern day society. The topic for the 1967 meeting was "Government, Science and International Policy" and in 1968, "Applied Science and World Economy."

In July 1968, the House Science and Astronautics Committee and the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee cosponsored a colloquium to discuss a national policy for the environment. Attended by committee chairmen and concerned members of both houses, the discussion centered on resolving the conflicts in multiple demands on our natural environment.

The Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development of the House Science Committee, in a report, identified twelve major problem areas which it said require Congressional scrutiny from the scientific and technological standpoint:

1. Protecting the Natural Environment.
2. Providing New Sources of Energy.
3. Application of Cybernetics.
4. Strengthening Information Management.
5. Induction of Industrial R and D.
6. Stimulating Transportation Innovations.
7. Diminishing Urban Congestion.
8. Enhancing Adequate Housing.
9. Improving Food Production and Distribution.
10. Alleviation of Crime.
11. Upgrading the Quality of Education.
12. Protecting the National Health.

The Subcommittee expressed its conviction that the "big issues" of the future will be the ability of the Government, and particularly the Congress, to see and to cope with each technological problem in its entirety, and to join the social sciences with the physical sciences and engineering to solve such problems. In concluding its report, the Subcommittee said, in part:

"Time was when man could afford to look upon the innovations of technology with some complacency. For the innovations came slowly, they were put to use in a relatively slow and modest fashion, and their side effects developed at a sufficiently relaxed pace to permit man to adjust to them—or to alter his course if the threat were great enough.

"Surely it is obvious that this day is gone. The tempo of our times can almost be described as a gait of 'running away.' The sum of scientific knowledge is doubling every decade or so—and our galloping technology is doing its best to stay on even terms. Human ingenuity has never had at its command a wider choice of tools with which to stimulate the economy, or defend the country, or provide for the general welfare or just to make money.

". . . We can no longer blindly adapt technology to our needs with the traditional assumption that there will be ample time to iron out any bugs on a leisurely shakedown cruise. A bigger effort must be made not only to foresee the bugs but to forestall their development in the first place. The alternative could be disastrous and indeed might turn our physical and social world into something uninhabitable.

The issues which led to the proposal of a Senate Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment have also been of increasing concern to the Executive Office of the President.

Testifying at the hearings on S. Res. 68, Dr. Donald Hornig said: "It is becoming clear that the Office of Science and Technology must learn to look beyond conventional statements of an environmental problem in an attempt to systematically survey the sum of individual actions."

The Federal Council for Science and Technology has established a Committee on Environmental Quality to coordinate the research and development work of the government agencies in this area.

The report of the Environmental Pollution Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee entitled *Restoring the Quality of Our Environment* is a step in the direction of comprehensive forecasting, as was its study on the *Effective Use of the Sea*, and its pesticide study. These have been essentially case studies.

The role of science and technology in the national effort to solve urban problems was the subject of a three week study sponsored by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Office of Science and Technology in June 1965, at the National Academy Study Center, Woods Hole, Massachusetts. Some fifty nongovernment specialists in the physical sciences, mathematics, architecture, engineering, urban planning, law, medicine and sociology, joined by staff members from the Federal agencies, met to discuss new techniques for blending physical and social engineering disciplines to attack the decay facing our major core cities, and to recommend new courses of action.

Another encouraging example of Executive Branch initiative in bringing together assorted technological disciplines to attack a basic environmental problem is the recent International Water for Peace Conference, attended by some 5000 administrative officials, technicians and diplomats from over 90 nations. The conference dealt with every conceivable facet of water use and development, including desalting, flood control, pollution abatement, irrigation and sanitation.

In addressing the Conference, President Johnson stressed the need to quicken the pace of science and technology, and by way of example he referred to the authorization of a new desalting plant with 3000 times the capacity than the latest plant produced 10 years ago, and at one twenty-fifth of the cost. "If science can unlock the door to an unlimited supply of pure and drinkable water," the President said at a prior conference, "I think it will be an event in human history as significant as harnessing the atom."

The above summary, by no means exhaustive, of activities to develop a scientific and technological know-how for human needs, and to blend the disciplines of the physical, social, and political sciences, provides an impressive background for the resolution under consideration. As these research efforts expand, and as the literature becomes more prolific, the Members of the Senate will want to keep up to date on the latest ideas and trends of environmental technology.

It is in this spirit that the resolution for a

Select Committee was framed. Such a Committee could develop a basic library of information and could lay a foundation for the continuation of both information-gathering and analysis for the legislative committees.

SENATE RESOLUTION 79—RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE TO MAKE CERTAIN STUDIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Commerce, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 79); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 79

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) interstate commerce generally, including consumer protection;

(2) foreign commerce generally;

(3) transportation generally;

(4) maritime matters;

(5) interoceanic canals;

(6) domestic surface transportation, including pipelines and highway safety;

(7) communications, including a complete review of national and international telecommunications and the use of communications satellites;

(8) Federal power matters;

(9) civil aeronautics;

(10) fisheries and wildlife;

(11) marine sciences; and

(12) weather services and modification, including the use of weather satellites.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1969, to January 31, 1970, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1970.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $550,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SENATE RESOLUTION 80—RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE PROBLEMS OF EDUCATION FOR AMERICAN INDIANS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 80); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 80

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the education of American Indians.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1969, to July 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than July 31, 1969.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $72,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SENATE RESOLUTION 81—RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE CERTAIN INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES BY THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. YARBOROUGH, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 81); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 81

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare including all matters relating to education; health; labor relations, labor safety, wages and hours, and migratory labor conditions; manpower training and utilization; poverty; railroad retirement; and veterans education, health, and readjustment to civilian life.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1969, to January 31, 1970, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $695,400, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SENATE RESOLUTION 82—RESOLUTION TO DISAPPROVE CERTAIN EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE, AND JUDICIAL PAY RATES RECOMMENDED BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware submitted a resolution (S. Res. 82) to disapprove certain executive, legislative, and judicial pay rates recommended by the President, which was ordered to lie over, under the rule.

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

SENATE RESOLUTION 83—RESOLUTION TO DISCHARGE THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF SENATE RESOLUTION 17

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware submitted a resolution (S. Res. 83) to discharge the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service from further consideration of Senate Resolution 17, which was ordered to lie over, under the rule.

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

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO FARMING—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 2)

Mr. BURDICK submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 500, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to limit the amount of deductions attributable to the business of farming which may be used to offset nonfarm income, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Senator JACKSON, I would like to announce a hearing on the nomination of Russell E. Train to be Under Secretary of Interior.

The hearing will be open and public, and will be conducted in room 3110 of the New Senate Office Building starting at 10 a.m., Tuesday, February 4.

Mr. Train, a native and life-long resident of Washington, D.C., is an internationally known conservationist and is president of the Conservation Foundation, a nonprofit research, education and information organization.

He is also Vice Chairman of the National Water Commission created by the 90th Congress to review the Nation's long-term water resource needs.

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 VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations to the Council of Economic Advisers.

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

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I compliment President Nixon on his choice of Hendrik S. Houthakker for the Council of Economic Advisers. I have a particular interest in the selection of this highly qualified individual.

On January 22, I reintroduced a tax-loss farming bill, S. 500, which would limit the amount of farming losses which nonfarmers may use as an offset against their nonfarm income. A bipartisan group of 26 other Senators has joined in sponsoring this bill. In addition, on January 23, companion legislation, H.R. 4257, was introduced in the House.

Mr. Houthakker wrote an article for Challenge, the magazine of economic affairs, when he was a professor of economics at Harvard, that deals in cogent terms with the very problem that is now the subject of this bill. I hope that in his position as a member of the Council, Mr. Houthakker will increase his efforts in support of this legislation.

Mr. President, so that other Senators may have the benefit of Mr. Houthakker's analysis of this problem, I ask unanimous consent that his article, which appeared in the January-February 1967 issue of Challenge, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE GREAT FARM TAX MYSTERY

(The taxable income farmers report to the Internal Revenue is a far cry from the farm income statistics of the Department of Agriculture.)

(By Hendrik S. Houthakker)

If we believe the United States Department of Agriculture, Texas farmers had a net income of $824 million in 1964. The Commerce Department, which is responsible for the national income accounts, put the figure at $844 million. But the Texas farmers themselves tell a different story, at least on their tax returns. According to the Internal Revenue Service, these same farmers did not earn a penny; in fact, they lost $60 million among them. Whom should we believe?

Nobody knows how accurate the Agriculture and Commerce Department estimates of farm income are, but there can be no doubt that they are in the right ball park.

In 1964 Texas had some 200,000 people who made their living wholly or partly from agriculture, and many of them did pretty well. The 10 million cattle and calves that roam the endless plains are not there merely for decoration. In addition, Texas produces more than one-half of the nation's cotton crop and a sizable percentage of its grains. To say that all this activity resulted in a net loss of $60 million is clearly preposterous.

Of course, it has long been known that farmers generally are not among the more enthusiastic taxpayers. Even in the Midwest, where compliance among farmers appears to be highest, the income declared by individuals on their federal tax returns is only between one-third and one-half the estimates by the Agriculture or Commerce Departments.

For the country as a whole, farm income in 1964 was $13 billion according to the Agriculture Department, and $12 billion according to the Commerce Department, yet only $2.6 billion was declared by individuals. Evidently, Texas is not the only state where there are large discrepancies between tax returns and other estimates of farm income.

In California, the number one farm state, farm income exceeds $1 billion, according to the Agriculture and Commerce estimates, yet only $42 million appeared on individual tax returns. And this is not because farmers do not file tax returns at all. Except in a few Southeastern states where there are many poor farmers, the number of farm returns filed agrees closely with the number of farms estimated by the Agriculture Department. The difficulty must be in what farmers put down on their tax returns.

It is true that there are some conceptual differences between the Internal Revenue Service figures and the other official estimates. The most important difference is probably that the IRS figures do not include partnerships and corporations for which no recent data are available. This omission does not explain a great deal, however. In 1962, the latest year for which figures have been published, partnerships and corporations reported only about $1 billion in farm income, and it is likely that their reporting is more accurate than that of individual farmers.

Apart from this, the only important conceptual differences refer to revenues from breeding cattle and from standing timber, both of which may be reported as capital gains. The treatment of other components of farm revenues and expenditures is essentially uniform.

Despite this conceptual similarity, it is very hard to pin down the reasons for the large discrepancy between the two estimates, known in the trade as "the farm income gap." In fact, there is no major discrepancy between the money *receipts* reported on tax returns and the money receipts estimated by the Agriculture Department.

In 1963, the last year for which this comparison can be made, money receipts of farmers (including both receipts from sales and government payments) amounted to $39.1 billion according to the Agriculture Department, while "business receipts" reported on farm tax returns (including partnerships and corporations) amounted to $37.1 billion. In addition, farm income should include about $1 billion for food produced and consumed on farms and $2 billion for the rental value of farm dwellings. It is likely that very little of this is reported on tax returns, although, in principle, it is taxable.

Together, these factors on the receipt side account for little more than $5 billion of the farm income gap, which amounted to somewhat less than $10 billion in 1963. The remaining $4.5 billion must therefore be on the expense side, but there again it is difficult to point to any major source of discrepancy.

The farm income gap is not only large; it seems to be growing larger. In 1962 the Internal Revenue Service figure for individuals was 27 per cent of the Agriculture Department figure; in 1963 it had dropped to 22 per cent, and in 1964 to 20 per cent. It had been as high as 32 per cent in 1957 and 30 per cent in 1958. Here again the case of Texas is especially significant.

In 1962 Texas farm taxpayers reported an income of $184 million; the next year they reported an income of $9 million; in 1964, as mentioned already, they reported a net loss of $60 million. In two years the farm income reported on tax returns therefore dropped by nearly a quarter of a billion dollars, yet the Agriculture Department figure for Texas fell only slighty between 1962 and 1964.

It is also interesting that the same thing happened on a smaller scale in three adjoining states. In Oklahoma, declared farm income dropped from $35 million in 1962 to virtually zero in 1964, and New Mexico went from an income of $29 million to a net loss of $14 million during this same period. Louisiana also went from a gain to a loss. In none of these states does the Agriculture Department estimate reveal any drastic change in agriculture's profitability.

Although we have no direct information that may account for these strange developments, there is a clue in the figures for metropolitan areas, which are available only for 1963. In fact, it was by looking at these figures that my attention was first drawn to the present subject.

It struck me as odd that the taxpayers of the Dallas metropolitan area reported a net loss of $44 million from farming, although this area does not include much farm land. Such urban farm losses are also found in a few other metropolitan areas, among which Houston, San Antonio and Oklahoma City may be mentioned. Dallas, however, exceeds all the others by a wide margin; even much larger cities such as Los Angeles and New York come nowhere near it.

Now Dallas is known, among other things, for its relatively large number of taxpayers with very high incomes. For such taxpayers there is a loophole in the tax laws which is especially interesting in a cattle-raising state such as Texas. As mentioned previously, the proceeds from the sale of breeding cattle may be treated as long-term capital gains, which means that they are are subject to no more than 25 per cent income tax.

On the other hand, the expenses incurred in raising these cattle (including depreciation) may be deducted from ordinary income, the marginal tax rate on which was as high as 91 per cent prior to the 1964 tax cut which brought it down to 70 per cent.

To the wealthy, cattle raising, therefore, offers splendid opportunities for converting ordinary income into capital gains. A number of examples of this were published some years ago by the Treasury Department.

Thus one manufacturer of chain link fences, who in 1960 declared an income of over $4 million, deducted some $246,000 as a loss on the raising of cattle and had a capital gain of about $65,000 on the sale of cattle. Since this man must have been in a marginal tax bracket of about 90 per cent, the loss on cattle, after taxes, was only about $25,000, while he could keep about $48,000 of the capital gain from sales. Although he lost about $180,000 before taxes, after taxes he was ahead by nearly $25,000.

Actually, this taxpayer may not even have had the best professional advice. It is apparently quite legal to take the deduction for cattle losses without declaring any capital gains on sales at all. The owner of a herd of cattle kept for breeding apparently only has to declare his gains when the whole herd is sold. Since a herd may last indefinitely, there is nothing to stop him from postponing the liquidation until his death, when the capital gains tax ceases to apply.

Treasury also mentioned the case of a "musician-conductor" who in two years deducted about $130,000 in losses on cattle without declaring any gains at all.

How widespread is the use of this loophole? The most recent data on this point refer to 1963, when farm losses still occurred only on

a modest scale. Of the 351 taxpayers with incomes over $1 million, for instance, only 69 reported farm losses, but they "lost" an average of $70,000 each. In this select group there were only 14 taxpayers with positive farm income.

For the same year it can also be calculated that taxpayers in marginal tax brackets of 50 per cent and over deducted a total farm loss of about $116 million, by which they saved about $78 million in taxes.

We do not yet know what the picture was after 1963, but the 1964 data quoted earlier indicate that, at least in Texas and adjoining states, the use of farm losses for tax avoidance has increased considerably. In fact, the Treasury itself may have unintentionally stimulated this practice.

In 1963 it proposed an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code that would have curtailed the use of the cattle-raising loophole. Congress refused to go along, but the resulting publicity on this angle was probably not lost on the tax accountants who cater to the very rich. It will be interesting to see more recent data on farm losses.

Pending the release of more detailed and recent statistics, we cannot say, with any certainty, that it is the cattle deduction that is responsible for the sharp drop in declared farm income in the Southwest. There may be other reasons.

It is certainly curious that the four states where the decline in declared farm income has been worst are all in the same Internal Revenue Service region, and that the headquarters of this region is in Dallas itself. If the Service ever decided to investigate the matter, Dallas would be a good place to start.

This does not necessarily mean that there is anything wrong with the way the Service enforces the tax laws; it may also be that the "cattle research" firms, which specialize in this type of operation, are particularly active in Dallas, and that the tax rulings from which they profit have gradually become known in other parts of the region.

The tax laws, in fact, are quite lenient on this point. The capital gains treatment of "livestock held for breeding, draft or dairy purposes" in an extension of a more general rule concerning "property used in business." If a retailer sells his used delivery truck, he has a capital gain on any profit made on the sale. The original idea appears to have been that if a farmer sold a bull that had passed its prime, he would be in a position similar to the retailer. A dealer in used trucks, however, does not get capital gains treatment; but a cattle breeder does.

This favored treatment of the livestock industry was no doubt intended to help agriculture, a sector for which Congress traditionally has a soft heart, though not always a hard head. Unfortunately, agriculture covers a multitude of sins. It is doubtful, in fact, if the capital gains treatment of livestock is of much help to the genuine farmers, who are rarely in high tax brackets.

On the contrary, by bringing pseudo-farmers with high nonfarm incomes into cattle breeding, it sets up unfair competition for those whose livelihood depends on it.

The further question thus raised is: Who is a farmer? This question has often come before the courts, and the upshot of all the litigation appears to be that everybody can be treated as a farmer provided he is not overly fond of farming. The tax laws are designed to prevent so-called "hobby farmers" from claiming a deduction for farm losses, but it is easy to escape this classification by asserting some hope of ultimate profit.

The mere fact of losing money year after year is not considered to make a taxpayer a hobby-farmer, but one rich old lady was put into this category (after at least 15 years of unbroken farm losses) when a misguided friend testified that she "just loved farming."

If the tax laws are to be effective in this area, a more sophisticated definition of farmers is needed, or, alternatively, the offsetting of farm losses against other income should be restricted. But this restriction has to be introduced with due regards to the interests of genuine farmers.

The best possibility would be to limit the farm loss deduction to, say, $10,000 in any one year, with provisions to carry larger losses backward or forward to be offset against earlier or later farm profits, but not against nonfarm income. In 1962 the taxpayers who claimed over $10,000 in farm losses had an average nonfarm income of about $50,000.

Another possibility would be to treat as farmers only those who have derived a specified fraction of their income from farming during the past five years.

Still another (similar to the Treasury proposal of 1963 which was rejected by Congress) would be to allow capital gains treatment only for the amount by which sales exceed deductions for farm losses in prior years. This proposal, however, would not deter those who do not take capital gains at all.

Unless something is done, it is likely that the livestock loophole is going to cost more and more tax revenue without any visible economic benefit. Of course, this loophole is only one element (and probably a small element) of the farm tax mystery. More analysis is needed to determine what the other elements are.

Analysis requires data, and, unfortunately, the data published by the Internal Revenue Service, though voluminous and accurate, leave much to be desired. Not only are they very slow in coming (the last year for which complete figures have been published is 1962), but they are not coordinated with other statistics, such as the National Income Accounts. It is, therefore, difficult to determine how good a job the Internal Revenue Service is really doing.

It is well-known that it collects a vast amount of money at a comparatively small cost (about 50 cents for every $100 collected), but this may testify as much to the law-abiding nature of the American people as to the efficiency of the Service. The data on farm taxation suggest this is one area where compliance could be considerably improved.

But if this sacred cow is to be finally eliminated, the Internal Revenue Service may need some help from Congress.

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

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of Defense.

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

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

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George A. Lincoln, of Michigan, to be Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness.

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

MILITARY STAFF COMMITTEE, UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. John W. Carpenter III to be senior Air Force member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations.

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

U.S. NAVY

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

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

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

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James E. Johnson, of California, to be a Civil Service Commissioner.

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, 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.

"OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES" OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Saturday last, under date of January 25, 1969, I sent a letter to all committee chairmen asking that they do what they could to oversee the legislation which had been approved by their committees, passed by Congress, signed by the President, and had become the laws of the land.

There has been some speculation that this was directed at the present administration, the Nixon administration, and the executive branch of the Government. I make this statement for the RECORD to make my position known without question.

Over 4 years ago, I met with the committee chairmen and asked them to undertake the responsibility for the oversight process, by means of which they and their committees could be assured that the legislative intent of Congress was being carried out and that the moneys appropriated by Congress were being spent as Congress intended. Then, on December 27, 1966, I sent a letter to all committee chairmen asking them to undertake this responsibility, and—to repeat—on January 25, 1969, I sent another letter to all committee chairmen expressing the same sentiments.

My purpose in trying to stress the oversight responsibilities of the legislative committees of Congress is to make sure

that as little duplication as possible takes place, that there is as much efficiency as possible, that waste of whatever nature and wherever found will be corrected, and that the laws are administered as Congress intended. This is a feeling which I am sure will have bipartisan support—and it has had that support—in this body. I am sure the executive branch of the Government will be most cooperative in seeing that this procedure is carried out.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letters which I sent on December 27, 1966, and January 25, 1969, to all committee chairmen, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C., January 25, 1969.

Sent to all committee chairmen.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You may recall that over the past four years I have emphasized the need of each legislative committee to carry out "oversight activities" on legislation which passes through it. The results to date have been very reassuring, and I hope that activities of this nature which have been pursued for sometime as, for example, in the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee and others inaugurated in recent years such as the oversight subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will be carried on by other committees so that the Congress can keep a close watch to insure that the intent of legislation as defined by the Congress will be carried into effect.

In this way, I think we can be reasonably assured that the funds allocated to carry out legislation will be spent in accordance with the intent of the Congress, that administration will be more efficient and less topheavy, that waste will be reduced, and that the people to be benefited will be given their just due.

If committees will assume responsibility through the creation of oversight subcommittees or by the designation of standing subcommittees to carry out this responsibility, it is my belief that the benefits accruing therefrom will be very substantial and that the end result will be a more effective application of the laws passed by the Congress.

I would appreciate it if you, as Chairman, would discuss this matter with your committee. I want you to know that the work which is already being done in this connection is very much appreciated. The purport of this communication is to urge the continuance and further development of the oversight function.

Must close now, but with best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

DECEMBER 27, 1966.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The great volume of legislation which has been enacted during the past few years has set in motion new federal programs which have been designed to correspond to the nation's changing needs. There comes to mind, for example, such measures as medical care for the aged, expanded health research, programs for curbing water and air pollution and for safeguarding the natural heritage of America, the effort to insure equality of treatment of all citizens, the acts which seek to deal with urban blight and unrest and the decay of vast rural areas and the many programs for the improvement of education.

So much basic legislation was enacted in the 88th and 89th Congresses that I do not anticipate requests for sweeping new legislative approaches in the 90th Congress. That is not to say all that confronts us in the session ahead will be the need to pass appropriation bills and then adjourn. It occurs to me that the next Congress will also see the convergence of a unique opportunity with a great need for a concentrated Senate exercise of the oversight function.

I would hope to see, in the first session of the 90th Congress, the beginning of a major re-examination of what we have done in legislation during the past few years. Considering the vast scope of this work and the unprecedented nature of much of it, it is to be expected that there exists a number of rough edges, over-extensions and overlaps and, perhaps, even significant gaps. A thorough and dispassionate re-study of this legislation, therefore, could lead to desirable refinements.

What applies to programs which we have set in motion in recent years, in my judgment, applies with equal emphasis to those of older vintage. There comes to mind, in this connection, legislation on the military draft, agricultural subsidies of one kind or another, foreign aid, income and other taxes and many others. Few if any of these older legislative structures have had a thorough-going, second-look for many years. These, too, it seems to me, might profitably be subject to complete re-study by the Senate. That kind of study could provide not only a basis for adjustments of legislation, as necessary, to the current needs of the nation but also a check on the equity and efficacy of the administrative interpretations and practices which have developed.

In short, what is suggested is that the Committee Chairman consult with the members of their committees to determine with respect to matters within their committee jurisdiction what, in their judgment, might be most usefully subjected to a thorough-going oversight at this time. To put it another way, I am suggesting that committees initiate on behalf of the Senate a concentrated re-examination of major legislative structures by which the federal government is enabled to play its role in the current life and affairs of the nation and the world. I do not anticipate much more than a beginning during the coming session. But the time seems to me to be very ripe for such a beginning.

May I take note, in closing, of some recent references to Viet Nam as though that were the only reason for a Congressional "stop-and-look" at this time. Insofar as I am concerned, the problems which confront us at home and abroad are no less problems because of the serious demands on our resources for Viet Nam. Nor is there any less need for efficient and effective government action, adequately but not wastefully financed, to meet these problems. With or without Viet Nam, in my judgment, the Senate of the United States, through its committees, would have a responsibility for beginning the kind of top-to-bottom oversight which is suggested herein.

With all best wishes for the coming year and warm personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

(Same letter sent to Committee Chairman: Senator Clinton P. Anderson, Senator Allen J. Ellender, Senator Carl Hayden, Senator Richard B. Russell, Senator John J. Sparkman, Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Senator Alan Bible, Senator Russell B. Long, Senator J. W. Fulbright, Senator J. L. McClellan, Senator Henry M. Jackson, Senator James O Eastland, Senator Lister Hill, Senator A. S. Mike Monroney, Senator Jennings Randolph, Senator B. Everett Jordan, Senator John O. Pastore.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, simply to implement what the majority leader has said, when the late Walter George, of Georgia, whom I considered one of the profound Members of the Senate, was still here, I recall that on one occasion he said to me, "DIRKSEN, if we could get the laws administered according to the expressed will and intent of Congress, this would be a different Government."

I have had reason to reflect upon what the late Walter George said, and how true it was, and how true it is. So I fully share the sentiment expressed by the majority leader.

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES—TRIBUTE TO STAFF MEMBERS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it was agreed by the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies that if a Republican President were elected in November, the chairmanship of the committee should devolve upon the minority leader of the Senate, and it did.

I knew that it was going to be an onerous burden, to say the least, and that we had to be fortified with some help. I therefore asked the secretary to the minority, Mr. Mark Trice, to undertake to give direction to the chores of the committee; and we selected a title for him—"Executive Director" and he cheerfully and willingly undertook it.

The assistant secretary to the minority, Mr. William Brownrigg, also was pressed into service, as was a former Senate employee, Mr. William Cheatham, former administrative assistant to the Sergeant at Arms. Mr. Cheatham came back just to help, because he was familiar with past inaugural ceremonies.

I should add Miss Dorothy Burns, who is secretary to the secretary to the minority, and Mrs. Jeanne G. Dorrance who shared the secretarial duties.

We also asked the Republican policy committee to lend a hand and they assigned Mr. Bryan F. La Plante, deputy staff director. Miss Cynthia Cronin also joined the staff for the final 2 weeks. Mr. Robert G. Dunphy, Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, his administrative assistant, Mr. Nicholas J. Lacovara, and his deputy, Mr. William H. Wannall, rendered competent and efficient service.

The fact that the inauguration went off without a hitch, I think, is a high compliment to how thoroughly the work was done in the field of security, the music, the clergymen, and others who were a part of the ceremony.

Likewise Bob Meredith, who is an assistant in the minority cloakroom, volunteered his services and was very helpful.

Then, I should add that my own personal secretary, Glee Gomien was truly a tower of strength and she dedicated herself to the job to make sure that insofar as possible everybody would be satisfied so far as tickets were concerned, and where they would find their places.

As the chairman of the committee I now thank each of them as profoundly and profusely as I can because I am deeply grateful for the work they did.

Mr. President, in going down the Avenue with the new President and the outgoing President, I noticed, notwithstanding the many rumors with which we had to deal, that there was decorum

and order, and in large measure it was due to the Metropolitan Police force, and up here on the Hill, to the Capitol Police force. I have undertaken to write to the heads of both of these police forces a letter of gratitude and appreciation.

CHICAGO POLICE DEPARTMENT AND MAYOR DALEY DESERVED CONDEMNATION OF COMMITTEE HEADED BY DR. MILTON EISENHOWER

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the report issued by the National Committee on the Causes and Prevention of Violence headed by Dr. Milton Eisenhower stated that the violence which occurred in Chicago during the Democratic National Convention was "overwhelmingly" on the police side to the point of being a "police riot." The investigators concluded that while some demonstrators were guilty of provoking the police through words and acts, the Chicago police were guilty of using excessive and often brutal force in handling demonstrators. More shocking is the conclusion of the committee that violence was "often inflicted upon persons who had broken no law, disobeyed no orders, made no threat" and who were peaceful spectators, newsmen, or merely residents of the area.

It is evident that in crowds of demonstrators there are invariably some individuals seeking to create trouble if possible. To say these persons are Communists or nihilists is a reckless misstatement of fact. Crowds of demonstrators can readily be controlled. Those nonviolent demonstrators in Chicago, and there were thousands of them, should have been protected by the Chicago police. Many were mercilessly beaten. Police violence in excess of authority is intolerable. It is dangerous. Who is there to protect the public when police violate the law? It is the duty of law enforcement officials to control violence, not to cause it or participate in it, as many policemen did in Chicago. It is clear now that Mayor Daley was guilty of overkill.

THE 91ST CONGRESS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in the 90th Congress this body passed a congressional reform bill which failed of action in the other body. I rise to express the strong hope that this Congress will give early consideration to immediate congressional reform so that we may have the opportunity of having it passed by both bodies.

I would like to express the same view with regard to the establishment of a separate Veterans' Committee, the proposal for which is before the Committee on Rules and Administration, on which I serve. Several bills have been introduced, one by the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), one by me, and other Senators have introduced similar bills.

I would also like to say that I hope the majority and minority sides can work out a system somehow in this session whereby the duplication of appearances of so many officials from the executive body before congressional committees can be minimized. I realize the nature of the problem, but in past years many Cabinet officers and heads of departments have spent interminable hours before Senate and House committees, and after having testified before one committee they are asked the same questions by another committee, and then another committee. If there were some way by which, where only a limited area of interest exists on the part of one committee, a committee could agree, with the consent of the committee having the major concern in the matter, to delegate some of its members to sit in on the hearing, it would help greatly.

If that cannot be done, and I know there is resistance, perhaps a plan could be agreed upon whereby the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, and others could be saved time by working out some sort of schedule whereby such a person might make his appearance within a given week before several committees so he could go back to the work for which he was appointed.

I hope some thought will be given to these matters and that is why I have expressed these views early in the session.

HENRY H. FOWLER, FORMER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, Virginia is proud of her sons who have served the Nation through the years. On December 20, another great Virginian terminated, for the present, his official service to the country. The Honorable Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury, known to practically all officialdom in Washington as Joe Fowler, returned to private life.

Joe Fowler was born and reared in Virginia and obtained most of his formal education in Virginia institutions. On November 8, 1968, Secretary Fowler submitted his resignation. I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary's letter to the President and President Johnson's response be printed in the RECORD along with an excerpt from the President's press conference on January 17, in which reference is made to Secretary Fowler's efforts in connection with eliminating the deficit in the balance of payments.

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

TEXT OF THE LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT FROM SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY HENRY H. FOWLER

A year and a half ago we discussed some personal circumstances which caused me to consider a return to private life. In the light of the economic and financial problems then confronting the nation at home and abroad, I deferred my departure.

Now the situation is quite different. Today, the nation's current economic, fiscal and financial posture and near-term outlook seems reasonably satisfactory and stable. On March 31 you announced your retirement as of January 20, 1969, and today, November 5, a new President will be elected.

You have been understanding and sympathetic with my need to relinquish my official responsibilities sometime before the end of the year, so that I may make some definite personal decisions for private life.

In this context, I am submitting my resignation as the Secretary of the Treasury and, with your consent, will leave that office on or about December 20.

Of course, after December 20 I would expect to make myself available to you, the acting officials of this Department, and the officials of the new Administration for whatever time would be desirable to complete the process of orderly transition for which we are making careful preparation.

In this connection, it may be useful to summarize the current economic and financial situation which our successors are inheriting as I see it today.

May I reassert what is implicit from our relationship after my previous resignation as Under Secretary in April 1964 and my service since you recalled me to this office—my personal loyalty and devotion to you, my deep admiration for the extraordinary ability, courage and dedication with which you have ennobled the office of the Presidency, and my gratitude for letting me share with you and my Cabinet colleagues the unprecedented accomplishments, as well as the difficulties, of the national government in these recent years.

It is my conviction that your Presidency is one in which the national government fulfilled, to an unusual degree, the purpose and promise of the Preamble of the Constitution for those living and generations to come.

In leaving, may I thank you and Mrs. Johnson and your staff for the personal kindness and unfailing friendship which Trudye and I will always treasure.

And, needless to say, I hope that when we have returned to private life and are no longer just across the street, there will be opportunities for two grandfathers to enjoy relaxing together as we recall the strenuous times.

God bless and keep you, Mr. President.

TEXT OF THE LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT TO SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY HENRY H. FOWLER

For three and one-half years you have sat at my side at the Cabinet table while we met the tests of our time.

I really know that the great adventure we have shared is drawing to a close and when I accept your letter of resignation.

You leave behind you a legacy to all the American people that few men could claim.

When the gold crisis threatened to destroy the world's monetary system, your firm leadership helped to avert disaster and assure the strength of the dollar. You were the grand architect of the most significant reforms in the international monetary system since Bretton Woods.

You were the man at the bridge who steered through Congress the anti-inflation tax so essential to our prosperity. And that prosperity—without parallel in the history of nations—will forever bear your mark. Men who know your reputation, and children who have never heard your name inherit that gift which you have labored so hard to fashion.

I know, Joe, at what personal cost you have served the people of America—well beyond the period of your initial commitment. You are one of the American great, who will be long remembered as the Secretary who thought of financial values in the broader context of human values.

Lady Bird and I have always treasured the strength which you and Trudye have given us through the blessing of your friendship. We look forward to drawing on that strength in the years ahead.

PRESS CONFERENCE NO. 135 OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 17, 1969

Question. How, sir, did you make the deficit in the balance of payments disappear in the last two weeks of your Administration?

The PRESIDENT. I think sometimes you are lucky and sometimes you are unlucky. I think it is a combination of very long and hard work, primarily on the part of Secretary Fowler, who is one of the most tenacious men I have ever known and who tried to be the guardian of the country and the trustee, and never let a dollar go out that he did not personally approve. He spent his last few months going around the world trying to bring as many dollars in as he could.

He recommended to the President and the President adopted a balance of payments policy that encouraged our business institutions to do some of their financing abroad.

The interest rate question, of course, helped. A good many people were attracted to this country by what they could earn on their money and also they are very interested in America's industrial system and our stocks. I don't think I did it all. I think we got some good breaks.

I think Secretary Fowler's vision and tenacity paid off and I think we had a good many friends in the world who helped us in circumstances that bounced our way.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA 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.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY, JANUARY 31, 1969

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 Friday next.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, as I understand the parliamentary situation, this would mean the pending business goes to the calendar and ceases to be the pending business on the floor. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It does not go to the calendar. It is still on the calendar, because it has never been taken from the calendar.

Mr. HOLLAND. Perhaps the majority leader states the matter——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to take up dies with an adjournment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I beg the Presiding Officer's pardon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to take up dies with an adjournment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Presiding Officer. That was exactly the understanding of the Senator from Florida.

The question I want to address to our distinguished leader is this: In view of the fact that those of us who are strongly opposed to the proposed emasculation of the cloture rule, rule XXII, are prepared to speak today, I want the RECORD to show that the distinguished Senators from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN and Mr. ALLEN) on this side have prepared addresses; and, likewise, that the distinguished Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN) is prepared to proceed.

It would seem to me that, in view of the announcement, in view of the press of committee business and other business elsewhere, it might be wise to request these gentlemen to be content with simply having the RECORD show their willingness and their preparedness to go ahead, without edifying the Senate with their proposed remarks or having an extension of their remarks printed in the RECORD, which means additional expense to the Nation. I am asking the distinguished majority leader if that would conform with his views, in view of the situation just announced by him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It would, indeed. The majority leader has no choice.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the majority leader. If he will yield further, and if the Presiding Officer will permit me, let me take this opportunity warmly to thank the majority leader, the minority leader, the whips on both sides, the entire leadership on both sides, and all Senators on both sides, for the very great courtesies which they have extended to those of us who, they may have thought, were a little bit obdurate in our position, but who, nevertheless, had very strong convictions on the matter which has been pending.

I just want to say that if any Senators have ever been treated with kindness and consideration, we have been so treated by those I have mentioned—in fact, by the entire leadership and memership of the Senate; and I want the RECORD to show that.

I thank the majority leader for yielding to me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate those comments. The distinguished Senator knows that in this body, courtesy is a two-way street. We get what we give. I must express my delight with the tone of the debate, if not with the results up to this time. But the leadership was faced with a number of choices. The resolution could have been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration with the request that it be reported back to the Senate at a time certain. That would, of course, have taken unanimous consent which I doubt would have been given. It could be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, where it very likely would have died a slow death.

The third alternative was to do what we have done just now.

The fourth alternative, which I am considering, because I do not think this matter is as yet dead, is the possibility of introducing a constitutional amendment which might be able to face up to a three-fifths proposal with some degree of rigidity in reverse, and give some assurance to those of us interested in such a ratio and who fear the imposition of a majority vote for cloture.

I thought that I should make these remarks so that the Senate will know what choices the leadership had, and what the leadership at this time is in the process of comtemplating and considering.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the distinguished Senator from Montana yield again?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I find new reasons for expressing my appreciation to the distinguished majority leader. Perhaps the idea of a constitutional amendment might be the answer to this problem and would give some protection to many who feel that this effort is just a step toward majority cloture. We have some reason to believe that because, with the exception of the distinguished majority leader himself, all of those who spoke yesterday in the cause of cloture upon the pending motion had previously voted to uphold former Vice President Humphrey, the then President of the Senate, in his ruling that majority cloture would lie and was the appropriate thing at the beginning of a new Congress in the considering of not just rule XXII but all rules.

Certainly the Senator will not find us completely obdurate in consideration of all matters. The Senator from Florida has already indicated that he himself favors one amendment which has frequently been mentioned here on the floor. The Senator from New Hampshire has mentioned another amendment which he favors. The Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER) has even offered an amendment at this early stage of debate. I am sure there will be other suggestions. It might possibly be a course that would meet with more or less approval to have this matter frozen in form into a constitutional amendment. I cannot speak for others. I shall not, at this time, speak finally for myself. But I am glad that the distinguished majority leader is thinking of such a far-flung basis of possible methods to deal with this very difficult situation.

Again I thank the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the sentiments just expressed by the distinguished Senator from Florida. May I say that the only rays of light which I have seen during the course of this debate, indicating a change in the rigidity of some of us, are the remarks made by the distinguished Senator himself as well as our distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT).

WILL CONSERVATION GET A WESTERN LABEL?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, one of the most interesting articles of comment on the Hickel nomination for Secretary of the Interior, and what is ahead for him, appeared in the Washington Post on Saturday, January 25, under the byline of Merlo J. Pusey.

The article asks the question: "Will Conservation Get a Western Label?" and points out how much wider are the horizons of the Interior Department than they were 8 years ago before the adoption of the total-environment concept of conservation. Mr. Pusey, who incidentally is a westerner himself, from my own State of Utah, emphasizes that the new Secretary of the Interior will have prob-

lems of "staggering dimensions" involving the entire country.

I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post article be carried in the RECORD.

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

WILL CONSERVATION GET A WESTERN LABEL?

(By Merlo J. Pusey)

(NOTE.—This is the seventh in a series of articles based on talks with key figures of the Johnson Administration about some of the problems confronting President Nixon.)

The furor that has ben raised about Governor Hickel tells us a great deal about what has happened in the Interior Department and in the country in recent years. People are much more alert to the perils of a fouled environment than they have been before. Conservation has become, not merely a regional interest of the West, but a vital concern of the entire Nation.

This is the basic reason for widespread concern over Governor Hickel's qualifications to be Secretary of the Interior. If he had come into the office a decade ago, few eyebrows would have been raised. The country would probably have acquiesced, with little concern, in the choice of a Westerner to do a Western job. Today, however, Interior is deeply involved with the protection of the environment in and about the great urban centers no less than with grazing and the preservation of geysers and stone arches.

Former Secretary Udall is entitled to a good deal of credit for having taken the Western label off the department. Though a Westerner himself, he sought to emphasize the department's new responsibilities in controlling water pollution and other aspects of our total environment. In an interview the other day he indicated that he regards the push toward a total-environment concept of conservation as his greatest accomplishment at Interior.

There is no indication that Walter J. Hickel understood this transformation of the Interior Department when he accepted President Nixon's offer to head it. But this is the fact confronting him, and it is against this background that his performance will be judged.

The effect of this transformation is greatly to multiply the scope of the problems that are tossed into the lap of the new Secretary. His task of cleaning up the Nation's rivers, for example, is staggering in its dimensions. To be sure, the Water Quality Act of 1965 and the Clean Rivers Act of 1966 provided the basic tools for this undertaking. But the program has not yet gotten off the ground.

One of the chief tasks is financing the sewage plants needed to keep filth out of the rivers. Hope of getting the $1.2 billion contemplated in Federal matching funds seemed to be very dim under the tight budgets foreseen ahead until a plan was devised to let the states issue the necessary bonds and allow the Federal matching funds to be supplied in the form of payments on the principal and interest on state bonds. A bill for this purpose, which would also bring the big cities into the program, was advanced almost to the point of enactment in the last Congress, but it failed in conference.

If the new Secretary puts fresh steam behind this idea, an enormous program in the construction of sewers may be anticipated. With the possible expenditure of $4 billion for this purpose, the economic impact may rival that of the highways program. Of greater long-range significance, however, will be the rescue of many majestic streams which are now little more than open sewers.

One other serious problem confronting the Interior Department appears to have been solved, at least temporarily, with Governor Hickel's pledge to continue the Udall freeze on the withdrawal of public lands in Alaska. Since most of the land in Alaska is owned by the Government, Congress agreed, in passing the statehood law, to give Alaska about 120 million acres of its own choosing. The gift was made contingent, however, on the undefined claims of Eskimos, Indians and other native groups. Because of the recent excitement over minerals and petroleum in Alaska, Udall suspended the withdrawal of lands by the state for two years so that Congress could legislate on the native claims.

Hickel had indicated that he might reverse this order because he viewed it as imposing severe restrictions on the state. In the hearings on his confirmation, however, he agreed to let the freeze remain, except in cases involving no native claims, so that the present Congress will have an opportuntiy to dispose of the matter in an equitable fashion.

Potentially the most troublesome problem that the new Secretary will have to deal with is the oil import program which he is to administer. The policy of restricting oil imports (today the inflow amounts to about 15 per cent of the country's total oil supply) was set up by executive order on national security grounds. The country, it is said, must maintain a healthy oil industry to make certain that we shall have ample fuel in case of emergency. But there is much dissatisfaction with the system as it now operates, and many feel that it should be abolished.

Former Secretary Udall noted the other day that the oil-import program "isn't exactly a freeze, but it has the effect, over-all, of kind of keeping things in status quo." Although Udall tried to give the system some degree of flexibility, many think he was too cautious.

Will Walter Hickel be less so? No one can be sure in advance how a man will respond to a responsibility of this kind. Some who know Governor Hickel say he has the toughness to stand up to the oil industry. Others fear that he thinks like an oilman.

A severe test will come when the Secretary is confronted by New England's plea for a free trade zone and a giant oil refinery at Machiasport, Maine. Occidental Petroleum would bring in relatively low-cost crude for refining in the free port and would make cheaper gasoline and fuel oil available in New England in addition to reshipping some abroad.

Governor Hickel originally opposed the project, but the current indications are that he is making a more thoughtful reassessment. There will be an acute need for appraisal of the project on its merits and for increasing flexibility in managing the oil-quota system. It is supposed to operate in the national interest, with equity for all sections of the country. If the Secretary of the Interior cannot effect adjustments on a reasonable and equitable basis, Congress may have to legislate on the subject.

Another urgent task for the new Secretary is the overhaul of the obsolete Mining Act of 1872. As Secretary Udall noted just before stepping out, this law operates "as an outright giveaway of vital resources." Miners may go onto public lands and seize and disrupt them. For a pittance a prospector may obtain several hundred acres of valuable mineral lands or national forest. Congress has even decreed that wilderness areas may be disrupted by this ridiculous system until 1988.

There seems to be ample reason for the conclusion that adoption of a new mining law is the most important piece of unfinished business before congress so far as natural resources are concerned. What is needed is a new leasing system that would bring the government adequate compensation for minerals taken from the public domain and at the same time protect scenic, recreational and wilderness areas.

The spurt of activity in recent years on national parks has by no means exhausted the possibilities. There is special need to concentrate on additional parks near the great urban centers, but the magnificent scenery still outside the National Parks System in Alaska, Hawaii and some of the other states should not be neglected. The merits of the immense parks proposed by Udall and rejected by L. B. J. in their last hours in office will need special attention.

The new Secretary will also be confronted by a creditable record bequeathed by his predecessor. It includes the creation and expansion of the Federal Land and Water Fund, the enactment of basic legislation for the control of water and air pollution, the establishment of the National Water Commission, creation of the wilderness system, the wild and scenic rivers system and the national system of trails. About 50 new units were brought into the National Park System, including national parks in the redwoods and the North Cascades and seacoast parks in many parts of the country. Wildlife was given greater protection with the creation of 39 additional refuges.

Continuation of the national policies behind these projects is of enormous importance to the country. Conservation has become an imperative of our generation if we are to recapture a tolerable environment and preserve it for the future. Udall has a phrase that fits well into the framework of this problem—"the development of higher concepts of earth stewardship." The new administration will necessarily have its own style and techniques in dealing with these problems but they need to be geared to a very broad policy of keeping our part of the continent a fit place to live in.

MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS LT. COL. JOE M. JACKSON AND MAJ. STEPHEN M. PLESS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, today is a holiday in Newnan, Ga., and an old-time celebration including a parade and barbecue is being staged to honor Lt. Col. Joe M. Jackson and Maj. Stephen M. Pless who wear the Nation's most coveted medal for bravery—the Congressional Medal of Honor. Although this grand affair and holiday is purely local and will only break the daily routines of the residents of this small city, some 40 miles southwest of Atlanta, it seems appropriate to me for the entire Nation to take note of this celebration.

When President Johnson decorated these men along with two others at the White House on January 16, it marked the first time two men from one city received the Medal of Honor at the same presidential ceremony. This would have been significant enough if they had come from one of our major metropolitan areas like New York, Chicago, or Atlanta, but this is particularly significant since they are both natives of a city of only about 15,000 people.

In serving their country above and beyond the call of duty, Colonel Jackson and Major Pless have brought great honor and distinction to Georgia and Newnan and they can also be considered as living testimony to the moral fiber and strength of character that is developed in smaller communities across the length and breadth of this Nation.

As heroes in the finest tradition of American military history, Georgia is proud to claim them as native sons. Over a span of years, I have heard my people denounced and charged with many weak-

nesses and human frailties, but even those with the most congenital prejudices against the people of the South have never accused them of being cowards. Quite the contrary, I have never known a military man in all of my years of connection with the armed service who did not generally welcome the opportunity to share a foxhole with a Georgian.

The White House ceremony at which these Medals of Honor were presented was also the final official tribute to America's fighting men by our Nation's Commander in Chief of more than 5 years. President Johnson served in an era when our country called for great sacrifices from the men who wear our Nation's uniform, and he has had to stand up under the endless tragedies of the war in Vietnam more than any other American. He has known the personal impact of this war as well as its impact on our Nation, and I think it was highly appropriate that, by coincidence, the honorees at this ceremony included a member of an Air Force military airlift unit and a marine major.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of President Johnson's remarks be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of this statement.

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

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE CEREMONY FOR THE PRESENTATION OF THE MEDAL OF HONOR TO FOUR MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES, THE EAST ROOM

Members of Congress, Secretary Resor, Secretary Ignatius, Secretary Brown, distinguished members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, members of the families, ladies and gentlemen.

For the final time during my Presidency this house is graced with the company of the heroes who have scaled heights known only to a very few men in this land.

The courage of the bravest in war is a rare and special quality. It knows no rank or station. Generals and privates have won the Medal of Honor. Riflemen and sailors, pilots and priests have worn it on their breasts.

It has gone to every kind of man that our country has ever produced. They have come from the cities and the farms in every section of our land—from very humble homes and from families of great wealth.

I don't know what there is in this Georgia water, but there is something very special in this ceremony. Two of the recipients today come from the same town in this great State of Georgia. It made me really sorry my grandfather left there, because it gives me such great pride in you gentlemen whose families had been friends even before you entered the service.

We have had workers and scholars, businessmen and professional soldiers. They have lived in different times, fought on different fields. They have demonstrated their bravery many times in different ways, but they have all shared one noble distinction.

Each man heard the call of duty in an hour of hard challenge and each man answered that call with a courage beyond demand.

So now the names of Jackson and Pless, Lassen and Dix are added to this roster of the very brave and the record of their deeds, at the very summit of human testing, will forever now be part of the history of valor.

The words "Above and beyond the call of duty" would never sound again in the world that we want and work for. Never again would war summon the best that men can give.

But when that day comes, there will always be a high place of honor for the men who have bought it—for all the good and gallant fighting men who took their duty as they found it, and discharged it always with a courage of giants.

Such men are with us here today, and we—who owe them and their comrades so much—all stand tall in their presence.

I should say that the thing that has given me more strength, as well as more comfort and confidence, in the five years of responsibility that I have carried, have been our men in uniform—from those distinguished, outstanding members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff down to the lowest sailor or airman, Marine or Army. They have never disappointed me once and they have preserved freedom for us many times with their own blood.

The Secretary will read the citations.

(The citations were read.)

I want, if I may, to meet the members of the families and the members of Congress. The Joint Chiefs are here. We want to thank all of you for coming.

If I may, I would like to have a picture with Mr. Pless and Mr. Jackson. I doubt that there are many towns of under 15,000 population that have produced two Medal of Honor winners in the same day.

I would like to keep this picture among my souvenirs because it happens that one of them is from the 123rd where I have a Loadmaster son-in-law, and the other is in the Marine Corps, that we have represented out there, too.

I want to send the other one to Secretary Rusk, because he is from Georgia.

Long before daylight this morning, I got a call that we were proceeding to an agreement with substantive talks in the Paris negotiations, which would indicate that we are a step nearer peace.

If we are, and we pray that we are, it will be because of men like your great commander, General Westmoreland, and men like you who offered your life to try to bring peace to the entire world.

THE FACTS IN THE "PUEBLO" CASE

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy and thoughtfulness of the distinguished Senator from New York in yielding to me at this point.

It is of utmost importance that all the facts surrounding the capture and loss of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* be known.

But I am not convinced the American people have been given all the facts. And, in one case at least, pertinent information has been removed from the permanent files of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

I share the views expressed on the floor of the Senate Tuesday by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi.

In his usual judicious and able manner, he set in perspective the purpose of the court of inquiry now being conducted in California concerning the loss of the *Pueblo*.

Senator STENNIS feels, and I concur, that it would be impractical for a congressional committee to begin an investigation until the Navy completes its hearings.

But there are many unanswered questions which go far beyond the scope of the Navy inquiry and involve the Department of Defense and foreign policy. One such question is—why was no effort made to go to the aid of the *Pueblo*?

During the weekend, I reviewed the testimony of then Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, given before the Senate Armed Services Committee on February 1, of last year.

The U.S.S. *Pueblo* had been captured the previous week and the committee was interrogating Secretary McNamara and General Wheeler on the *Pueblo* capture, and this question was raised.

The facts are these, as given the Armed Services Committee by top Defense Department officials on February 1, 1968:

The *Pueblo* at 10:50 a.m., Korean time, on January 23, 1968, reported that two North Korean ships had made passes at her at about 12:25 the preceding day, and that she had had 18 additional contacts during the preceding night, the closest at 3,000 yards.

The *Pueblo* was not boarded until 13:28—1:28 p.m.—on the 23d. Boarding was not completed and the *Pueblo* did not come to a complete stop until 14:32, almost 4 hours after she radioed that she was in trouble and had been in trouble since 12:25 the previous day.

According to General Wheeler's testimony, the Navy requested help and the final decision not to intervene was made by the Commander of the Fifth Air Force in Japan, the aircraft being under his control.

There were U.S. aircraft in substantial numbers at bases in Japan, only 40 minutes flying time from the *Pueblo*. The planes were combat ready.

Indicative of the public's difficulty in obtaining an answer to this and other questions, I cite a personal experience from these same hearings.

During the testimony, I called to the attention of Secretary of Defense McNamara the widely published statement by a high Japanese official that U.S. aircraft in Japan could not have been sent to the aid of the *Pueblo* without the consent of the Japanese government.

I asked Secretary McNamara to comment on the accuracy of that statement. The Secretary responded.

When the official transcript was sent to the Defense Department, the Department marked my question and the Secretary's answer as a part of the testimony which could not be made public because of its diplomatic sensitivity. When I learned of this a few weeks later, I protested this censorship.

The reason I raise the question now is that in studying Saturday the complete testimony in the committee files—the committee's permanent copy—I find that I put 10 questions to Secretary McNamara, and that one of the 10 including his reply has been entirely scissored out of the report by the Department of Defense.

The committee clerk tells me that this is the only time during his 22 years with the committee that he has known material to be deleted by scissors from the permanent committee report. The normal procedure is to mark in red those portions of testimony which cannot be published, but the report itself remains as a permanent file in the committee vault.

As it is, the Secretary's reply to an apparently significant and vital question is written on air, unavailable for committee study as it attempts to piece together the tangled facts of the *Pueblo* incident.

I feel security deletions are necessary at times and justified. I think it is important that all military information, all information that could be of value and of importance to the enemy, be deleted from any testimony that is released to the public.

But nothing can justify keeping this information from the review of the congressional committee charged with that responsibility.

I feel it is important also that the public be given all information that it can appropriately be given without giving aid and comfort to the enemy.

I feel that Congress and the American people are entitled to more facts than have been made available up to now.

Therefore, I urge a full hearing by the Senate Armed Services Committee at the conclusion of the Navy's own inquiry. This hearing should not be limited to the facts in the *Pueblo* case, but it should also consider the broader questions which that incident has raised.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Staunton (Va.) Leader of Sunday, January 26, captioned "Where Lies the Blame" be inserted.

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

WHERE LIES THE BLAME?

Fear that the Navy would make Comdr. Lloyd M. Bucher the goat of the Pueblo's seizure has probably been augmented by the statement to him at the inquiry being held at Coronado, Calif., that he may be court-martialed on a charge of disobedience of orders. The specification would be, Navy counsel declared, that he failed to resist the attack by North Korean gunboats and boarders.

The regulation cited to Comdr. Bucher reads: "The commanding officer shall not permit his command to be searched by any person representing a foreign state, nor permit any of the personnel under his command to be removed from the command by such person, so long as he has the power to resist."

That Comdr. Bucher could be charged under this regulation is, as the record now stands, a ridiculous assertion.

Evidence that the Pueblo had only two .50 cal. machine guns, mounted in exposed positions and which Bucher testified malfunctioned in tests, is unrefuted. Surrounded by a squadron of Communist naval craft, at least one of which opened fire to cover boarders, what chance would the little U.S. ship have had to resist successfully? To attempt it would have resulted in what military men term "an unnecessary effusion of blood"—the blood of the crew.

The Pueblo skipper, from evidence adduced so far and from investigation prior to the release of the crew after nearly a year's imprisonment and abuse, did the best he could. Having been denied "destruct" equipment for the electronic spying system aboard, adequate equipment for quick destruction of codes and files and armament with which to fight effectively, he destroyed what he could and surrendered in order to save his men. His statements that it would have taken 2½ hours to scuttle and only a few minutes for the icy water to kill his men had he been able to scuttle have not been refuted.

Why air support was not given the Pueblo immediately after Bucher radioed that he was being attacked has never been satisfactorily explained. Lt. Col. J. Addison Hagan, a retired Marine officer, made the following statement in a letter to a Washington newspaper a few days ago:

"Adm. Sharpe issued orders to Vice Adm. Bringle to use the amount of force necessary to 'cut and return' the Pueblo on the day of its capture. However, Adm. Sharpe's orders were countermanded, and, consequently, the Pueblo was not allowed to resist the North Koreans. When the Pueblo was attacked on Jan. 23, 1968, planes were dispatched from South Korea and arrived in exactly 37 minutes. The pilots saw the Pueblo being attacked and boarded but received a radio message not to attack."

Col. Hagan, if the Board of Inquiry really wants to fix responsibility for the Pueblo's loss, ought to be summoned to testify as to the sources of his information. The suspicion that the Pueblo was sacrificed by a top level decision not to risk resumption of the Korean War because of our involvement in Vietnam and the Tet offensive then in progress there, will not down.

The American people are entitled to know the facts, which at this stage cannot damage us militarily. Court-martialing Comdr. Bucher for the surrender, or for his "confession" and savage beatings and mental terror in which fear for the lives of his men was a principal constituent, would on the record as it now exists be a further disgrace to this country. Let's not forget that our government itself "confessed" in order to free Bucher and his men.

THE ABM: UNSAFE AT ANY PRICE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the decision to authorize and appropriate funds for the deployment of the Sentinel antiballistic-missile system was a tragic mistake. The great weight of the evidence presented indicates that the Sentinel ABM would not be effective against an all-out missile attack.

Eminent scientists such as Dr. Jerome Weisner, former adviser to President Kennedy, Dr. George Kistiakowsky, adviser to President Eisenhower, Herbert York, Hans Bethe, Richard Garwin, Ralph Lapp, and others have all urged delay of this project. It is my opinion that our efforts should be directed toward further research and development before we begin constructing an ABM that may not ever perform properly.

Later on in this session, the Senate will again reconsider the merits of this project. It is my hope that the majority of my colleagues will thoughtfully reconsider their position and vote to delay deployment.

In a recent article by my colleague Senator MCGOVERN appearing in the February issue of the Progressive magazine, the ABM issue is carefully discussed. I think this excellent article is worthy of careful examination and therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted in the RECORD.

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

THE ABM: UNSAFE AT ANY PRICE

(By Senator GEORGE S. MCGOVERN)

(NOTE.—Senator GEORGE S. MCGOVERN, South Dakota Democrat, was re-elected last fall after his unsuccessful candidacy for the Democratic Presidential nomination. He was a bomber pilot in World War II. A professor of history and government before he was elected to the House of Representatives in 1956, Senator McGovern was the first director of the Food for Peace program and is the author of two books, "War Against Want" and "A Time of War/A Time of Peace.")

The anti-ballistic missile (ABM) is a remarkable device. It is remarkable for its technology, its speed, its acceleration, its complexity. It is even more remarkable for the effect it may have on the course of Soviet-American relations during the next ten years, and for its capacity to devour enormous sums of public funds allocated to the military sector of the nation. Most remarkable of all, our country may spend many billions of dollars on an ABM deployment before the system has been carefully evaluated and during the precise period that we most need to scale down both the costs and the hazards of the arms race.

Let me state at the outset my own firm conviction that the building of an ABM system by the United States would be a national blunder of major proportions—militarily, economically, and politically. I am convinced that the proposed ABM would be obsolete and ineffective before it could be constructed; that for far less money than the cost of any ABM system, the Soviets could and would place us in an even more vulnerable position by increasing their offensive capacity.

No one has more clearly summarized the case against the ABM than former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, who said on September 18, 1967: "Every ABM system that is now feasible involves firing defensive missiles at incoming offensive warheads in an effort to destroy them. But what many commentators on this issue overlook is that any such system can rather obviously be defeated by an enemy simply sending more offensive warheads, or dummy warheads, than there are defensive missiles capable of disposing of them. And this is the whole crux of the nuclear action-reaction phenomenon." And, added McNamara, "Were we to deploy a heavy ABM system throughout the United States, the Soviets would clearly be strongly motivated to so increase their offensive capability as to cancel out our defensive advantage. It is futile for each of us to spend $4 billion, $40 billion, or $400 billion—and at the end of all the spending, and at the end of all the deployment, and at the end of all the effort, to be relatively at the same point of balance on the security scale that we are now."

I believe that an ABM deployment by the United States would actually decrease our security, not only because it could be easily penetrated by the Soviets, but because it would lead to a further escalation of the arms race and a worsening of Soviet-American relations. Beyond these considerations, the allocation of many billions of dollars of tax funds to the ABM would threaten our national security by depriving us of funds desperately needed to cope with the explosive social and economic needs of our own society and of a world in ferment around us.

It is my considered judgment that last year the Johnson Administration yielded to the pressure of the military-industrial complex in agreeing to deploy a "thin" ABM system supposedly against the Chinese. This was not a security decision based on a broad view of national and international priorities; it was rather a surrender to mounting political pressure from military-minded Senators, Congressmen, generals, and arms manufacturers. All of this was fed by the mistaken impression that it is possible to calculate national security in mathematical terms related exclusively to the size of our defensive and offensive armament.

As Dr. Jerome Wiesner, former science adviser to the President, has reminded us on several occasions, the political pressure on the President and the Defense Department to deploy the ABM was not new. For more than a decade, the Pressure had been directed at

President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and President Johnson. Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy wisely resisted the demands for the Nike-Zeus and then the Nike-X ABMs. If they had surrendered, we would have wasted an estimated $30 billion on a system that would now be completely obsolete and worthless. I am confident that the system now being pressed will prove equally obsolete and equally ineffective but even more costly and dangerous than the earlier system.

I believe that when President Johnson finally yielded last year to the ABM deployment pressure, he committed what could prove to be, next to the Vietnam escalation, the most costly blunder of his Administration. President-elect Nixon could perform an invaluable service to the American people and to the cause of peace if he would begin his Administration by ending our military involvement in Vietnam, which I believe he will do, and reversing the ill-advised deployment of the ABM.

Recognizing that the only real defense against the sophisticated missile system of the Soviet Union is our continued capacity to deter the Russians from using it, the Administration justified the abandonment of its previous opposition to the ABM by saying that we were now building it as a temporary $5 billion holding action against China.

This justification appeared so patently weak when the delays in China missile development became known that the China argument was largely dropped and the Congressional debate centered on the need to begin developing a full-blown defense against the Soviet Union. During the Senate debate, I asked the proponents of the ABM why they had announced the new system as a defense against China and then stated later that the system could be abandoned if the Russians would agree not to build one. They had no answer to that question.

The truth is that if we begin a $5 billion "thin" system, the political and economic pressures will quickly mount until we have poured $25 billion to $50 billion and perhaps a hundred billion dollars into this system. I say that if we do not halt the present move to deploy the so-called thin ABM system, we will spend a minimum of $50 billion on this system before we finally agree a few years hence that the whole exercise was a colossal military, economic, and political blunder that has weakened us as a nation both at home and abroad.

A comparable investment in cleaning up our cities, training our youth for jobs, strengthening our agricultural and natural resources, and attacking the misery which breeds disorder both in our own society and in the developing countries will do far more to build American security and our leadership for peace.

It is true that the ABM has functioned fairly well under laboratory conditions. When a single ABM is launched against a single simple ICBM warhead approaching on a known trajectory, the chances of successful interception are reasonably good. But if we deploy an ABM system, we can be reasonably certain that no nation will ever attack us with a single ICBM. We would more likely be attacked by large numbers of complex offensive missiles, almost all of which can be expected to use multiple warheads and penetration aids, and some of which may be able to change trajectory in mid-flight. This situation is qualitatively different from that of a laboratory test.

It is worth emphasizing that defense against thermonuclear missiles is a qualitatively different problem from World War II style anti-aircraft defense. In World War II it was assumed by both attackers and defenders that on any given raid, most of the bombers would reach their target and drop their bombs somewhere in its vicinity, that they would damage the target and perhaps destroy it, and that most of them would return safely to base to fly further missions. The job of the defenders was to impose attrition sufficiently high so that the attackers would no longer find it profitable to continue the attacks. Generally, this critical attrition rate was surprisingly low. For example, on the night the British destroyed five per cent of the attacking German bomber force, the defensive battle was won; the bombers did not return.

Missile warfare is entirely different. To begin with, attrition means nothing in the World War II sense, for it is assumed that no offensive missiles will return to base. What is important is the number of warheads that reach their targets. The smallest warhead is still considerably more powerful than the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs and can destroy any target except a few of our largest cities.

While a five per cent effective defense won the Battle of Britain, in a nuclear war, in which each significant target might be attacked by a dozen or more missiles averaging perhaps four or five warheads each, even ninety per cent effective defense could not prevent a catastrophe of unspeakable proportions.

And one should also keep in mind that the Soviet Union is not likely to remain static, but would, rather, respond to a U.S. ABM deployment by increasing its offensive capability. We could then build up our defense still further to offset their increased offense, but in this sort of escalatory spiral the defense is at two inherent disadvantages.

First, there is the mathematical disadvantage. Currently, the other side has approximately 1,000 offensive warheads. If we were to build a ninety per cent effective defense, they could still hit us with 100 warheads—a blow which would shatter our society. The consequences of such an attack, even ruling out the fallout from incoming missiles and from our own interceptor missiles, are so enormous as to be beyond comprehension. The loss of lives would still be calculated in the tens of millions. But this is not the whole story. Supposing the Soviets responded to our ABM system by increasing their number of warheads to four or five thousand as we have recently done. If we then increased our defense to maintain ninety per cent effectiveness, we could be hit, not by 100 warheads, but by 400 or 500. If we wished to maintain our defense at the pre-ABM Soviet response level of 100 hits, we would have to improve the ABM's effectiveness to a fantastic ninety-eight per cent.

This is not possible. In fact, it is probable that during a heavy attack the effectiveness of an ABM system would drop to near-zero. A nuclear explosion in the atmosphere creates a cloud of ionized gas, lasting for several minutes, that distorts or absorbs radar waves. An ABM is entirely dependent upon ground-based radar for guidance. In a light or medium attack, the attacker could use the explosion of one warhead, or of the ABM sent to destroy it, to blind the defensive radar to another warhead following close behind. In a light attack, the defender could possibly counter by tracking each incoming warhead from several different directions with different radars. In a heavy attack, however, involving hundreds of offensive and defensive detonations within a short period, an effective defense is inconceivable.

The defense's second inherent disadvantage is economic. Former Defense Secretary McNamara and others have discussed the matter of cost-exchange ratios—which in this context means the cost to a nation of building up its offensive missile power to neutralize any increase in the potential enemy's defensive capability. Although one cannot be precise because many of the critical variables are classified, it seems quite clear that in the attempt to reduce significantly casualties resulting from a heavy attack, the cost-exchange ratio must be highly favorable to the offense. Consider, for example, the conversion from the offensive Polaris system to the newer, more sophisticated Poseidon missiles, for which unclassified cost figures are available. This conversion, according to Dr. Wiesner, will increase the number of U.S. submarine-based warheads from approximately 600 to more than 4,000. The new warheads will be smaller, but they will be considerably more accurate, and will make up a far more effective striking force. The cost of this conversion is expected to be $3.2 billion.

What kind of cost-exchange ratio can be applied to this conversion? How much money would the defense have to spend to offset this increase in offensive power? Surely a cost-exchange ratio of one to one or one to two would not be valid. The Sentinel defense system is projected at $5 billion; yet the offensive Poseidon system would cut through Sentinel like a hot knife through butter. The "heavy" ABM defense system is projected at $20 billion, and to reach full effectiveness will probably run to several times that. This heavy system includes about 4,000 missiles, which would be the equivalent of one ABM for each Poseidon warhead. Granting a generous assumption of eighty per cent effective defense under a major attack, the heavy ABM system might reduce Poseidon to Polaris levels of destruction, giving a cost-exchange ratio of one to six at best. In other words, the defensive cost of neutralizing eighty per cent of the new Poseidon missiles would cost six times as much as Poseidon cost.

Given the high levels of offensive armament which both major powers will have by the mid-1970's, the proposed terminal ABM system, even in its heaviest form, would be ineffective. This system can easily cost a hundred billion dollars, if one includes the cost of the fallout shelters necessitated by the Sprint anti-ballistic missile. Why, then, are the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommending that the money be spent? Why is a majority of the Congress agreeing with them?

Curiously, the debate over construction seems irrelevant to the actual decision-making process. I have been involved in the Senate debate on this issue and have listened to Senator Stuart Symington, a former Secretary of the Air Force, explain in great detail why the ABM is militarily ineffective, and I have waited for an effective rebuttal by the ABM proponents. It has never come. I have read similar analyses by eminent scientists and I have waited in vain for a rebuttal by a member of the scientific community. Instead of rebuttals of the charge of ineffectiveness, one hears various arguments based on the *assumption* that the system is effective.

The reason for this is that the proponents of ABM feel that the military and scientific arguments do not need to be rebutted, for the true reasons for funding the ABM are not military and scientific, but economic and political.

Politically, the power to get acceptance for highly dubious multi-billion dollar projects such as the ABM rests on at least two factors.

First, there is the exploitation of national feelings of insecurity—sometimes bordering on paranoia. Many Congressmen fear that if they vote against any proposal carrying a defense label, they will be criticized for jeopardizing the nation's security.

Second, there are the perfectly legal but substantial rewards the military establishment can bestow upon communities and states whose Congressmen are cooperative.

I do not mean to imply that supporters of the ABM have sold their souls to the armament lobby. These men are acting in what they believe is the interest of their constituents. The creation, continuance, or abolition of a defense plant or installation may affect

thousands of jobs and millions of dollars in purchasing power. Such considerations weigh heavily on the minds of Congressmen eager to please their constituents and to win reelection.

But let us face it: The Anti-Ballistic Missile is little more than a gigantic make-work military project. This kind of artificial and wholly unimaginative spending is degrading to the American society. The production of ineffective military hardware is not a healthy contribution to society. If our economy requires that the government spend billions of dollars each year, let it be spent in reconstructing our cities and depressed rural areas, in purifying our air and water, in improving our health, education, and nutrition, and in other ways that will be of real benefit to the citizens of the United States. Let us not waste money on ineffective gadgetry.

I am not suggesting that our military-industrial complex be disbanded. I am saying that our military procurement should be a function of our national security needs rather than of the financial and military appetite. Our defense industries have marvelous research, development, and production ability that could well serve the civilian needs of our nation if properly directed.

Five years ago I introduced the National Economic Conversion Act which proposed comprehensive study and planning to assist in converting excess military production ability and military funds to civilian needs. Although my proposal was not enacted, it should have been. We should now be well past the study stage and into actual conversion.

We need desperately to develop the competence on every level of government, from the city council to the White House and throughout the private sector as well, to convert resources no longer needed by the military into other useful purposes. This is the rational way to cope with the "potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power" in the "military-industrial complex" about which President Eisenhower warned us so eloquently in his great farewell address of January 17, 1961.

We live in a magnificent country but we have not yet crossed into the promised land. We are confronted by urgent domestic needs that are neglected because the nation's financial, human, and material resources are being poured into sterile military make-work projects. We must redirect this money, talent, and resources to meet the needs of our people. We cannot afford to do otherwise, for what is at stake is the quality of our society and a more meaningful expression of the human spirit.

OKUN'S EXCELLENT JOB

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Dr. Arthur M. Okun, as Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, served brilliantly. He served with distinction and effectiveness at a period when economic policymaking was particularly difficult. Only 40 years of age, the former Yale University professor has already had an outstanding career, and he is only beginning.

Arthur Okun, born in Jersey City, N.J., in 1928, received his A.B. and Ph. D. degrees from Columbia University. He taught at Yale from 1952 to 1961, at which time he came to the Council to serve as a member of the staff under the distinguished Chairman, Walter Heller. He returned to Yale for a short period, but in 1964 was brought back as a Member of the Council of Economic Advisers and became its Chairman in January 1968.

Okun specialized in the application of quantitative techniques to economic forecasting and policy analysis, as have an increasing number of the younger economists in the postwar era. Though "a numbers man," as the phrase goes, he was a strong and skilled exponent of the instruments of public economic policy in promoting economic stabilization and growth.

Although I did not always agree with his recommendations, I was always impressed by the high competence and dedication that he displayed.

Okun's balanced and able contributions to the debates over public policy will be missed in the circles of Government, but we are confident that his voice will not be stilled. We wish him well in the years ahead. The Brookings Institution is indeed fortunate to obtain his services.

THE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION TREATY—WHY WE MUST ACT

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, this body will soon have before it one of the most basic documents bearing on the continued survival and well being of all people on earth. I refer to the international treaty designed to prevent the spread of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons.

There are some among us, Mr. President, who pretend not to be worried or even apprehensive over the inexorable spread of the capability to create such engines of destruction. It would be kindness to call them people of little vision.

No one can contemplate with equanimity the spread of a technology that deals with mastery of the elementary forces of our world. Especially so in light of our realization that man cannot deal with this knowledge in a morally consistent manner.

Regrettably, we must admit that most nations of the earth are so bound up in nationalism, factionalism, regionalism, and ideological conflict that they cannot objectively view the future and how their knowledge can affect it.

In fact, we must face up to the sobering acknowledgement that there are some nations with a capability to create these weapons, which are at daggers-point with other nations. Should they possess these weapons and face military defeat, they would be almost bound to resort to any extreme in order to survive.

This is particularly true of those powers whose rivalries are so intense, and involve such hatred that military defeat could mean physical or national extinction.

We must face up to the fact that there are countries in the world, recognized as sovereign states, which are led by regimes that can at best be termed irresponsible. There are nations in the world today who would, given the opportunity, use nuclear and thermonuclear weapons without hesitation in order to attain their selfish, limited goals.

There are men in positions of authority who would carry the world up to and over the brink of international annihilation in order to satisfy their egos, cater to their vanity, or swell their pride. If such men have sacrificed their own armies in the past as well as the well-being of entire populations, we have every reason to expect they would care not a whit for the peace and survival of our entire world.

We are in the midst of an age when traditional spheres of influence have become meaningless. An age when each great power maintains a shifting group of client states that often slip their reins to pursue limited goals that can cause international ripples. It is an age when massive infusions of weapons that are obsolete to armed forces of major powers can shift area power balances. It is an age when even a limited amount of leeway can be and is misconstrued by a client state. There is the ever present danger of a client state carrying a superstate over the brink of disaster by pursuit of limited goals. Addition to this equation of nuclear and thermonuclear weaponry adds an element of menace to the world situation that we cannot allow.

It is imperative that we control smaller states who would create intolerable international situations. It is essential that we prevent such states from coming into possession of weapons that could almost instantly create confrontation. It is all-important to keep heavy hardware out of the hands of deadly little men who put grandeur before peace—glory before security and personal gratification before world progress.

The Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty would prevent the further spread of these engines of destruction. It would keep such weaponry out of the grasp of these irresponsible hands.

Further, it gives members of the nuclear club a required breathing spell in which to arrive at some type of modus vivendi. The world is now rife with a series of entangling alliances that resemble those that afflicted Europe prior to World War I. Then, as we all recall, actions of smaller states dragged all the powers over the brink of war. There must be a line drawn affecting these weapons and their relationship to these alliances. This treaty would do this. Time is short in the extreme.

Only an international agreement of the sort envisioned by this treaty can prevent the spread of this menace to still other areas of the world. To my mind, there is no choice but one remaining to us.

If we do not prevent the spread of these weapons, they shall end up by destroying us. For a moment, let us contemplate the very real consequences of unchecked nuclear proliferation.

In addition to dangers I have already alluded to, there is the possibility of accident. Can a smaller nation with limited resources afford the safeguards against accident, abuse, or misuse of such weapons? Can it prevent the lunatic, irresponsibles or fools from abusing such paraphernalia? I think not. And what about that irresistible urge on the part of all scientists to investigate and tinker with such apparatus?

Think of the tens of thousands of people who would begin to obtain access to such engines of death. Consider the consequences. We are even now junking weapons systems that would tip the balance of power in innumerable areas of the world. These systems must be kept out of the hands of others.

Dangers from all this are played down by some. They say no matter what tran-

spires, we have the hot line. We have instant communications with the Soviets. But is that enough?

In an age when seconds are beginning to count—when we spend billions to obtain a few minutes of warning time—who is going to waste time if there is an unauthorized or immediately unexplainable nuclear or thermonuclear explosion on their territory or on that of a closely allied client state—particularly if that state is in some sort of formal alliance with the superpower immediately affected?

We must, therefore, think in terms of the almost immediate danger our world faces, compounded each time another nation obtains access to this technology and its fruits.

There are times when we simply must act in the interests of all mankind. This is one of those times. It behooves us to consider this treaty and ratify it with a minimum of delay.

ON RELATIONS BETWEEN THE MOST POWERFUL COUNTRY AND THE MOST POPULOUS COUNTRY IN THE WORLD

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, last weekend a Japanese-American parliamentary group met at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions at Santa Barbara, Calif., and spent 2 days discussing relations with China. The distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, delivered a paper at that conference entitled: "On Relations Between the Most Powerful Country and the Most Populous Country in the World."

Because I think that Members of Congress and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD interested in the subject of our relations with the most populous country in the world, whatever may be their views, would find the views of the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of great interest, and as it is fitting that a new member of the center should do this, I ask unanimous consent that the full text be printed in the RECORD.

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

ON RELATIONS BETWEEN THE MOST POWERFUL COUNTRY AND THE MOST POPULOUS COUNTRY IN THE WORLD

(Statement by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, meeting of Japanese-American Parlimentary Group at the Center for Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, California, January 24–25, 1969)

I

A perceptive commentator has written about ancient China:

"The nation was absorbed in productive industry; the greater part of its scientific processess had been preserved, but science itself no longer existed there. This served to explain the strange immobility in which they found the minds of this people. The Chinese, in following the track of their forefathers, had forgotten the reasons by which the latter had been guided. They still used the formula without asking for its meaning; they retained the instrument, but they no longer possessed the art of altering or renewing it. The Chinese, then, had lost the power of change; for them improvement was impossible. They were compelled at all times and in all points to imitate their predecessors lest they should stray into utter darkness by deviating for an instant from the path already laid down for them. The source of human knowledge was all but dry; and though the stream still ran on, it could neither swell its waters nor alter its course."[1]

That commentator was not someone normally regarded as a China historian or an Asian expert, but a writer known for his observations of America, Alexis de Tocqueville, and he was describing the China Europeans had first seen three hundred years before.

Perhaps his comments could apply as appropriately in describing certain features of contemporary American behavior, for in this latter half of the 20th Century it often seems that, as far as some questions confronting us are concerned, *we* have lost the power of change and are compelled to imitate *our* predecessors. And one of the questions of which this is true, it seems to me, is that of American-Chinese relations.

I use the word "relations" for lack of any better term, because, with the exception of sporadic conversations in Warsaw, there have been virtually no relations between the world's most powerful country and the world's most populous country for twenty years. Since 1949, when a communist regime took power on the mainland, our attitude has been one of unrelenting hostility in most respects, met—it should be noted—by at times an equal, and at times an even greater, measure of hostility on the part of China. We saw the communist regime's assumption of power not as a result of the sickness and frailties of China under the nationalists, but as an extension of the Soviet conquest of central Europe, for communism was then regarded, with considerable justification, as a monolithic movement.

It was thus not surprising that the success of the communists in China, following immediately the events in central Europe in the years immediately after the end of the war, dismayed and alarmed the American people. The North Korean attack on South Korea in June, 1950, followed by the intervention of Chinese forces in November of that year, which brought us face to face with Chinese soldiers in combat for the first time in our modern history, was a further shock. Although the cold war had frozen our relations with the Soviet Union by 1950, American and Soviet armies had never fought one another. The first large communist power we were to meet on the battlefield was not the Soviet Union but China.

II

As a result of these events, and the emphasis of the new Chinese regime on spreading "armed revolution", we were to base our policy towards China on certain assumptions. The first of these assumptions was that China was a hostile and aggressive nation which threatened to impose communism on Asia by force, as the Soviet Union had imposed communism on central Europe. The second assumption was that all communist regimes were joined together indissolubly in a conspiratorial compact to conquer the world and that the communist countries should be regarded and treated as a monolithic entity of awesome power and frightening potential. The third assumption, somewhat contradictory to the other two, was that if everything possible was done to weaken China—if sufficient economic and political pressures were exerted—the new mainland regime would fall because it did not have popular support and because Confucianism and communism, like oil and water, would not mix.

These assumptions led us to surround China with military force and to isolate the mainland with every means at our disposal. In the words of Kenneth Young, President of the Asia Society, since 1950 the United States "has treated Peking as an aggressor and outlaw, refused it diplomatic recognition, blocked its membership in the United Nations, prevented its taking over Taiwan, encouraged its 'passing away', isolated it diplomatically and economically, confronted it with overwhelming force, and undertaken military operations along China's west and near China's southern flank."[2]

During the Korean War, we also reversed the decision that had been articulated by President Truman in a speech in 1950 in which he said that the United States "will not pursue a course which will lead to involvement in a civil conflict in China" and "will not provide aid or advice to the Chinese forces on Formosa." Instead, the United States became Nationalist China's strongest and most active supporter.

In the past few years we have begun to talk about China, and to think about China, in somewhat different terms. But it is only the phraseology that is different. In the words of a former government official who is a well-known authority on China, ". . . if anything characterizes Washington's attitude toward Peking in the last eight years it is the change in words without a change in policy."[3] Yet our policy has remained unchanged even though the events of the last two decades should have caused us to question the original assumptions on which this policy was based.

As far as the assumption that Communist China is a power bent on military expansion abroad is concerned, I do not see that the present Chinese government has made any serious attempt to expand its territory beyond its present borders. The Chinese forces which fought us in Korea are no longer there, and North Korea has, in fact, become less pro-Chinese and more neutral in the Sino-Soviet dispute in recent years. Nor did Chinese forces remain in India. And in the case of Tibet, the Chinese took over a territory that not only the Peking government but also the Nationalist government and even the Indian government has long regarded as Chinese.

As for communist-led and directed insurrections in other Asian states, China has certainly encouraged and supported these insurrections or "wars of national liberation", but, so far as I am aware, has not participated directly with Chinese combat forces. There have been threats of direct participation, but China has not suited her actions to her words.

Certainly the Peking government hopes that "wars of national liberation" will succeed not only in Vietnam but in Laos, Thailand, Burma and other Asian countries. They have made no secret of their desire in this regard. But a desire to see such wars succeed, a desire which is certainly no stronger than our desire to see such wars fail, is one thing. Ability to insure success is quite another.

Wars of national liberation can be and are supported from the outside, as attempts to defeat them can be and are supported from the outside. But it seems to me that they are essentially home-grown products which sprout from complaints and frustrations and are nourished by government ineffectiveness, disinterest and corruption. The fears which some Asians express of direct Chinese expansion, or of indirect Chinese intervention, often seem to me to be attempts to blame internal infirmities on external factors.

It is doubtful whether China presently could be successful as an expansionist military power even if she desired to be one. While the Chinese have a powerful land army capable of defending the mainland against almost any combination of forces, if mobile

---

Footnotes at end of article.

forces, strategically positioned, are necessary for expansion, it is we and not the Chinese who have that potential. And if the evidence of a capacity and desire to expand is the presence of a country's troops outside its own territory, what conclusion should be drawn from the fact that the only Chinese soldiers outside China are engineer and air defense units in North Vietnam, while, in Asia alone, we have more than half a million troops in South Vietnam, over 50,000 in South Korea, and some 40,000 in Thailand, as well as naval or air installations in Japan, the Philippines, Taiwan, Okinawa, Guam and elsewhere.

The second assumption on which our China policy has been based—the assumption of a monolithic communist world—is quite obviously no longer valid. It is surely not necessary to describe in detail the splits among communist countries which have led one commentator to refer to communism as "a many splintered thing." Suffice it to say that the examples of the widely different paths followed in the European communist world by the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, Romania and Albania are by now generally well recognized, although the diversities among communist states and parties in Asia are less familiar.

The most important division in the communist world is, of course, that between China and the Soviet Union. I have been told that those who have visited China recently have reported that Soviet revisionism, rather than American capitalism, has become the principal foreign devil. In fact, even if there had not been an ideological split between the Chinese and the Soviets, it seems doubtful to me that these two states would have been able to maintain close relations, if indeed such close relations ever existed. The Chinese have lost large stretches of territory to Russia and seem to fear further losses. And Chinese resentment of the West apparently extends to Russia as well.

As for the third assumption—the assumption which rested on an exaggerated notion of China's weakness, perhaps to balance those assumptions which rested on an exaggerated notion of China's strength despite all predictions to the contrary, the communist regime has not only survived but has, according to all reports, provided the Chinese people with better conditions of life than any other modern Chinese regime. The Peking government certainly continues to face many problems, but so would any regime confronted with the awesome task of administering a nation of eight hundred million people.

It has been officially admitted, and seems finally to be generally accepted in the United States, that there is nothing that we, much less the Nationalist Chinese, can do to bring about the collapse of the present mainland government. Nevertheless the hope still seems to persist in certain quarters, both here and abroad, that the Chinese will rise up and overturn the communist regime. This hope was nurtured by the turmoil in China known as the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

Those who regarded the cultural revolution as evidence of an imminent collapse in China seemed to me to have badly misunderstood this phenomenon. It now seems clear that this strange disruption was really a struggle between the more militant Chinese ideologists, the old revolutionary veterans who wished to keep revolutionary fervor at a high pitch regardless of its consequences, and the more pragmatic managers and scientists who preferred to see ideology subordinated to more practical considerations. The Cultural Revolution did leave certain questions unanswered, questions relating to whether the Chinese revolution would move in new directions or continue in the same general direction it has followed to date. These questions concern the *course* of the regime's future, but they have nothing whatsoever to do with the question of *whether* that regime will have a future.

IV

If the assumptions on which our policy toward China have been based for the past twenty years are no longer valid or appropriate, it would seem to me to follow that the policy itself should change. Should we not discard the objective of containing China and, despite official disclaimers, isolating it as well? Perhaps more accurately, should we not discard a policy of helping China to isolate itself in favor of seeing what can be done to involve China in Asia—and Asia in China, I should add—and to influence China to play a constructive and stabilizing, rather than a destructive and disruptive, role in the world?

It seems to me that there are several minor actions that could be taken to this end by the United States, actions which have already been suggesed and discussed by China experts in this country. Removing all travel restrictions and, in fact, encouraging travel is one such action, the benefits of which are so obvious that they do not need to be discussed. I see no reason to insist, in advance, on any Chinese promises in this regard. If the Chinese are not yet willing to admit American tourists—not to mention journalists, doctors and scientists—it is China's loss far more than it is ours. We have recently taken the sensible step of announcing that any Chinese who wish to visit the United States will be welcome. I do not see why we should not now proceed to the next step and announce that we will validate all passports for travel in China, and not just the passports of those with some professional reason for wanting to visit China.

It is unfortunate that we would not be able presently to afford American tourists going to China the same kind of protection which we afford those going to countries with which we maintain diplomatic and consular relations. But this would be a risk for the travellers themselves to take. I see no reason for us to place obstacles in the way of their visiting China if they desire to do so, even if there is little prospect that the Chinese will admit them.

Another minor action that could be taken is in the field of trade. Our original concept was that an embargo on trade with China would have such deleterious economic effects that the Chinese would be willing to make concessions in order to have such an embargo removed or would be weakened to the point of exhaustion or even expiration. This theory has not held up when applied to other countries, and I question whether it would have succeeded in the case of China. In any event, it proved to be nothing more than a theoretical concept because other non-communist countries were not willing to participate in such an embargo. In fact, China now does most of its trade with our major allies—the United Kingdom, Japan, West Germany, Australia, Canada, Italy and France. Our attempted embargo has thus had little economic effect, but it has certainly further embittered our relations with China and has done nothing to enhance our reputation in their eyes. When, in 1959, we prohibited the transshipment of a cargo of Chinese canned prawns and soy sauce destined for Canada, a Chinese poet wrote in Peking:

"Neither canned prawns nor soy sauce
May America's borders cross;
Canadians, amazed, confused,
Are irritated and amused.

"Soy sauce endangers security,
The reason's there for all to see,
So deeply red it's purple nearly
—Criminal nature proven clearly.

"And as to Chinese big prawns canned,
They obviously must be banned;
In armor cased from tail to head,
When boiled they turn a fiery red.

"An Iron Curtain America blinds,
Hysteria grips the White House minds;
'Strategic goods'—what is they're edible?
Such idiocy is scarcely credible."[4]

I would agree that our trade policy is "scarcely credible." Surely we cannot use the war in Vietnam as an excuse. If we did, we would not trade with the Soviet Union or with any other communist countries, because the Soviets and other European communist states are providing North Vietnam with sophisticated military equipment which far exceeds in value or importance the assistance being given by the Chinese. I see no reason for not entering into peaceful trade with mainland China, restricting such trade to so-called non-strategic goods. Nor do I see any reason why we should not encourage other countries to trade with China and even to extend long-term credits to mainland China. Our attitude in the past has not been encouraging in this regard, to say the least.

V

But travel and trade seem to me to be relatively simple obstacles to the development of something approaching a normal relationship with China, so simple that it is surprising they are so difficult to dismantle. The more difficult and important obstacles are Taiwan and Vietnam.

I do not doubt that the Peking government would like to see the United States defeated in Vietnam and a communist government, or pro-communist government, installed there. I am sure that Peking would prefer sympathetic to hostile governments in the states surrounding China, just as we prefer sympathetic governments in the Western Hemisphere. China would also undoubtedly prefer to see "wars of national liberation" succeed, as I have noted, just as we would like to see them fail. But perhaps more importantly, it would seem obvious to me that Peking would prefer to see American military power removed from Southeast Asia, power which China feels—rightly or wrongly—threatens her directly. I would venture to guess that as long as there is a massive American military presence in Southeast Asia on the scale that now exists, progress towards an accommodation with China will be difficult.

I do not mean to imply that such progress can result only from an American defeat in Vietnam. After all, China has been willing to accept compromise settlements in Southeast Asia before—in Geneva in 1954 and again in 1962 at the conference on Laos.

The 1954 agreements banned the introduction of fresh troops, military personnel, armaments, munitions and foreign military bases in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos and restricted the participation of these three states in military alliances. In the final declaration of the Geneva Conference, the members of the conference—including the Peoples Republic of China—agreed "to respect the sovereignty, the independence, the unity and the territorial integrity" of Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam and "to refrain from any interference in their internal affairs." The 1954 Geneva agreements thus seem to me to amount to neutralization of the area in dispute in fact, if not in name, and the 1962 conference on Laos resulted in a specific "Declaration on the Neutrality of Laos" in which the parties—again including the Peoples Republic of China—declared that they would respect the neutrality of the Kingdom of Laos, would not bring Laos into any military alliance "inconsistent with her neutrality" and would not introduce any foreign troops into, or establish any foreign military installations in, that country.

I see no reason to assume that the Chinese would not again accept a compromise settlement in Southeast Asia if, regardless of the character of the government which would

Footnotes at end of article.

result in Vietnam, the settlement provided that Vietnam would be neutralized and that no foreign bases or forces would remain there. We ourselves have declared our willingness to withdraw all our forces from Vietnam—implicitly by referring to the Geneva agreement of 1954 as an acceptable basis for settlement and explicitly in the Manila Conference communique.

It follows from what I have said about an eventual settlement of the war that if the stage is reached in the negotiations when parties other than those now present in Paris will be asked to participate—or if the negotiations are extended to relate to countries other than Vietnam, to Laos, for example—I believe that mainland China should be invited to be present.

VI

But of all the obstacles to moving toward a more normal relationship with China, the question of the future of the government of the Republic of China on Taiwan is by far the most difficult because it is the most important to Peking. It seems to me that the time has come when we should suggest that the Chinese themselves solve this problem—the Chinese on the mainland and the Chinese on Taiwan. We should insist that the solution be reached peacefully and we should also make it clear—clear beyond the shadow of a doubt—that we will continue to honor our 1954 Mutual Defense Treaty with the Republic of China.

At the same time, however, I think that we should move to reduce further our direct military involvement in the Taiwan area as a sign that we are willing to do our part in lowering the temperature that has, at times, brought the Taiwan Strait almost to a boil. We have already ended virtually all of our economic assistance and substantially reduced our military assistance program to Nationalist China. I would favor a further reduction in military assistance for, after all, Nationalist China has armed forces which total 600,000 men. I would also think that we should announce that, as soon as events in Vietnam permit, we will begin removing the limited military facilities we have on Taiwan and also turn over to the Nationalist Chinese the responsibility for patrolling the Taiwan Strait.

Can the Chinese themselves solve the seemingly intractable problem of Taiwan? My answer would be that, in the first place, *only* they can solve it. And in the second place, surely both the Chinese on the mainland and the Chinese in Taiwan have a mutual interest in reaching a solution. The two million Chinese on Taiwan cannot continue to justify their role in the world on the obviously fictitious argument that they represent the eight hundred million people of mainland China; it is difficult enough for them to justify the argument that they represent the eleven million Taiwanese. And surely at least the future leaders of China, and perhaps even the present Peking government, will not wish to continue to see the assumption of China's proper role in Asia blocked in perpetuity. "Eventually," one authority has noted, "the Chinese will have to come to terms with both themselves and the outside world." [5]

VII

The complex problems which revolve around the words "Taiwan" and "Vietnam" will take years to unravel. In the meantime, it seems to me, everything possible should be done to clear the air. I have already referred to actions regarding two minor problems—trade and travel—that could be taken. In addition, I think it would improve the atmosphere if the United States were to state clearly and unqualifiedly that this government is willing to recognize that the Government of the People's Republic of China controls the mainland of China, that we look forward to the time when that government will be willing to enter into diplomatic, trade and cultural relations with us and will also be willing to join the United Nations, and that we are willing to meet and discuss these questions at any time and at any level including the level of foreign minister.

It does not seem to me that the most recent statement on this subject by a high government official, made in mid-1968, that "the territory controlled and administered by Peking is obviously not unknown to us" carried quite the meaning I have in mind. There was, I felt, some grudging condescension in this formulation, the kind of condescension that the richest and most powerful nation in the world need not demonstrate.

I do not mean to advocate immediate, unilateral recognition, for I believe that in the present circumstances such an action might have harmful repercussions in other countries. But I do believe that we should declare ourselves ready and willing to reach agreement on the question of recognition whenever the Peking government is willing to do so.

I also believe that we should stop twisting arms in the General Assembly so that hands will be raised—or not raised—on votes related to the question of Chinese representation. We should change, in other words, from leading the opposition to the admission of China to the United Nations to abstaining on the issue, and simply let this matter, which involves the Peking government and the Nationalist Chinese government, be resolved, in the first place, by the Chinese themselves and, in the second place, by all of the states represented in the United Nations.

It may well be that these gestures on our part will be ignored by the government of mainland China. Perhaps, after centuries of Western degradations and fifty years of almost constant revolution, what China needs most of the West is to be left alone for a while. Perhaps, too, the Chinese leadership wishes to continue using our hostility and Soviet hostility as a means of sustaining revolutionary fervor and displeasure at a high pitch. One scholar has observed that the "bogey" of Soviet revisionism had become "an indispensible ingredient" in Mao's "domestic policy" so that any cessation of polemics would be "anathema" to the Chinese leaders,[6] and another has written:

"Indeed, it is not too much to say that the United States has a 'revolutionary alliance' with Communist China. To be sure, this is not an 'alliance' in Western terms of interstate dealings carried out within a framework of international law and diplomatic conventions. Rather, it is cast in Mao Tse-tung's view that the 'U.S. imperialism' is one of a series of enemies allied to his cause of uniting and motivating the Chinese people, through tension and hatred for the tasks of creating a new society." [7]

VIII

Nevertheless, there have been some signs recently that the Chinese may be willing to lift the Western fringe of the Bamboo Curtain at least a little. I refer, specifically, to the Chinese suggestion that the Warsaw talks with the United States be resumed on February 20 after a lapse of more than a year.

The statement issued by the Chinese on November 26 annonuncing the suggestion stated that the Chinese government had consistently adhered to two principles in these talks—first, that the United States "undertakes to immediately withdraw all its armed forces" from Taiwan and the Taiwan Strait "and dismantle all its military installations" in Taiwan; and second, that the United States Government "agrees that China and the United States conclude an agreement on the five principles of peaceful coexistence."

So far as I am aware, the language used in the Chinese statement with regard to Taiwan is more restricted than past public pronouncements devoted to relations with the United States. The statement is more restricted because while it asks for the withdrawal of American armed forces from Taiwan and the dismantling of American military installations on Taiwan—installations which, I should add, are rather modest in modern military terms—there is no specific reference to any Chinese determination to liberate Taiwan, an omission noticed by the Soviets who might be expected to be particularly sensitive to every nuance. While this omission does not mean that the Chinese have changed their attitude on the question of Taiwan's future, it does seem to me to indicate a willingness on the part of China to adopt a more flexible approach to the United States.

The language regarding agreement on the principles of peaceful coexistence is another such indication. There has been no reference in public statements to peaceful coexistence with the United States since the mid-1950s, to the best of my knowledge. I am intrigued by the fact that the Chinese are suddenly willing publicly to state their willingness to agree with the United States on the question of "the five principles of peaceful coexistence." These principles are, after all, propositions on which we should both be able to agree. They are, it is worth recalling, respect for each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity, abstention from aggression and threats against each other, abstinence from interference or intervention in the internal affairs of one another, recognition of the equality of races, and recognition of the equality of all nations, large and small. I do not see how this list could be improved upon as a general prescription for future relations between any two states.

Undoubtedly, there is much more to the latest Chinese statement than meets the eye. For one thing, it may be intended to signal a certain settling down in Peking after the convulsive years of the Cultural Revolution. For another, the change of administrations in Washington is undoubtedly a factor, a factor that it seems to me we should also regard as providing a possible opportunity for a new approach to Sino-American relations on the part of both countries. And certainly there must be a relation between this latest Chinese statement and the bitter state of Peking's relations with Moscow.

It seems to me that all three of these factors, and perhaps the latter especially, could well work for the improvement of our relations with mainland China. To date we have been very much the object of the Sino-Soviet rivalry. Each of these two countries has seemed, at times, to compete in seeing which can be the more anti-American. I would think that we would much prefer to be the object of Sino-Soviet competition to see which of these two great powers could enjoy better relations with us.

The balance of power may be an old principle, but it is certainly not obsolete. Perhaps if we act wisely, it will assume a new, and more constructive, importance which will bring unsuspected and unanticipated benefits not only to us but to many nations and will improve the prospects for peace in the Pacific. History is replete with far more curious paradoxes.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* (New York: Vintage Books, 1945), p. 48.

[2] Kenneth T. Young, *Negotiating with the Chinese Communists* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1968), p. 4.

[3] Allen S. Whiting, "Time for a Change in Our China Policy," *The New York Times Magazine*, December 15, 1968, p. 28.

[4] Yuan Shui-po, *Soy Sauce and Prawns* (Peking: Foreign Languages Press, 1963).

[5] Lucien W. Pye, "The Authority Crisis in Chinese Politics," (University of Chicago Center for Policy Study 1967), p. 25.

[6] Richard Lowenthal, "Mao's Revolution,"

Encounter, Vol. XXVIII, No. 4, April, 1967, p. 9.

[7] Richard H. Solomon, "The Pattern of the Chinese Revolution," *Current History*, Vol. LV, No. 325, September, 1968, p. 173.

EXPERIENCE KEEPS A DEAR SCHOOL—LET US NOT REPEAT THE MISTAKES OF A PAST ERA

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, hundreds of special-interest bills to restrict imports for the benefit of certain industries—from chemicals to strawberries, from baseball gloves to oil—were introduced in the last Congress. Fortunately, very few were enacted into law. It is certain that most of these legislative proposals will be introduced again this year in both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The jobs of more than 3 million American working men and women depend on the products we export to other nations. During the past 20 years, the United States has earned $80 billion more from exports than the total sum representing purchases from other nations. Should we start down the protectionist road, as certain as night follows day there will be a new spiral of inflation, higher prices for consumers and a drastic decrease in our exports. Our already serious balance-of-payments problems will worsen instead of gradually becoming less ominous. We must not go back to the days of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff which in 1929 raised tariffs to an average over 50 percent. Our exports then plummeted and the sad "Hoover depression" resulted. During the administration of Herbert Hoover, as a result of that tariff wall, factories in cities were shut down and farmers could not sell their products. Some 14 million worthy and industrious men and women walked city streets jobless. Millions of little children went to sleep hungry and underfed night after night. Prices for wheat and corn plummeted. Farmers were not making enough money to pay their taxes and interest on their mortagages. Many were confronted with foreclosure actions. Farmers gathered on courthouse steps threatening the orderly processes of the law. The entire financial structure of the United States had collapsed. Banks in the 48 States were closed.

It would be a folly to again build a high protective tariff wall around our country. The terrible depression of the early 1930's must not be forgotten. It is suicidal to restrict imports. We must sell the products of American farms and factories in world markets, and American men and women desire to purchase products imported from abroad and at reasonable prices.

THE CHALLENGE OF THE GHETTO TO MARKETING—REMARKS OF SENATOR WALTER F. MONDALE BEFORE THE AMERICAN MARKETING ASSOCIATION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the last several years have taught us much about the nature of poverty in this land. Gradually the facts and statistics about health, education, and social service needs are beginning to emerge. More recently, attention also has been focused on the consumer problems of the poor.

While social service and professionals from many fields have been involved in the antipoverty effort for some time, business and industry, and the professional organizations that represent them now are beginning to play a role.

One such organization is the American Marketing Association. Representing diverse interests, this organization last June held a conference to explore, among other matters, the responsibilities of marketing in social affairs.

Among the most interesting statements included in the proceedings at that conference was one by my eminent colleague, Senator WALTER MONDALE, of Minnesota. Detailing the problems of the ghetto, Senator MONDALE went on to issue a challenge to marketing to become involved, and to bring its talents to bear on some of the serious problems consumers face in the ghetto.

I ask unanimous consent for the inclusion in the RECORD of Senator MONDALE's speech entitled "The Challenge of the Ghetto to Marketing."

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

THE CHALLENGE OF THE GHETTO TO MARKETING

(By Senator WALTER F. MONDALE)

(NOTE.—*The Senator discusses conditions in the ghettos, graphically detailing the problems which society must solve. He challenges marketing to become involved and bring the talents and methods of marketing problem-solving to bear on improving ghetto conditions.*)

INTRODUCTION

In the years since Michael Harrington's "Other America" opened the eyes of a nation, the recognition of domestic poverty has slowly begun to sink into our social awareness.

We know something about poverty now. We know it is—

Lack of income: 34 million Americans officially defined as living on "poverty level" incomes;

Lack of jobs: unemployment rates in some central city ghettos of 25–35%;

Lack of decent housing: more than 8 million substandard housing units befouling our urban and rural slums;

Lack of education: up to a quarter or more of those who enter 9th grade failing to graduate.

In short, we know poverty has many dimensions, and that its costs can be counted many ways—

In the individual frustration and fear that lead to riots;

In the social separation that is making of unity two nations, one black, one white;

In the economic loss of undeveloped human capital, and undeveloped buying power.

We know the causes of poverty are numerous, interrelated, and difficult to change. We know they are—

Historical—the Poor Law tradition that punished people for their poverty and led to a welfare system that now keeps them there;

Individual—the apathy, arrogance, and indifference of those who could have prevented poverty years ago;

Institutional—the vast array of public and private sector organizations which either keep poor people out, or work to keep them poor.

All must share in the collective guilt for this state of affairs both in public and private sectors.

It makes no difference now that most of the decisions creating the situation were unconscious. Poverty is more the result of social "drift" than of individual malevolence.

The fact is that the problem exists, and that it must be attacked now, at every level, and in every sector of our society—individual, organizational, and institutional.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would submit that marketing is part of the ghetto's problem, and must be part of the solution.

MARKETING AND THE GHETTO; THE NATURE OF THE CHALLENGE

The ghetto is one place Adam Smith's "invisible hand" hasn't reached. The laissez faire system never guaranteed distributive justice. And no one knows that better than the poor.

Ghettos are like inland lakes, cut off from the marketing mainstream.

Walk around a ghetto. What do you see?

Inefficient stores;

Low-quality goods;

Marginal merchants.

Talk to these merchants. What do you hear?

Poor people mean poor profits;

High crime rates boost operating costs;

Riots destroy us for we can't get insurance.

Listen to the poor. What do you learn?

We are paying more;

We need jobs and income *in* the ghetto;

We want to own businesses ourselves.

All of these statements are true. Collectively, they sketch the ghetto market situation.

The Poor are exploited: As Paul Rand Dixon and others have pointed out, the fact that "the poor pay more is not a slogan, it is a fact." [1]

What the FTC and others have found in Washington, and across the country is this:

Price markups for durable goods in the ghetto two to three times those in the general market;

"Easy" credit in the ghetto costing 10–15% more than credit in the general market;

High pressure techniques and shady practices in the ghetto not tolerated in the general market;

Punishment by court-ordered garnishments and repossessions in the ghetto at a rate many times that in the general market;

The poorest of the poor—those with half the "moderate" income getting "taken."

Poverty Fosters exploitations: As this Riot Commission Report points out, exploitation of the poor is a "complex situation": [2]

Lacking cash, poor people have to rely on credit;

Lacking steady jobs, the poor are refused general market credit, and must turn elsewhere;

Lacking cars, poor people can't get to low cost discount stores in suburbs;

Lacking consumer education, the poor don't know how to get help from financial institutions, the law, or sources of consumer advice.

Ghettos Drag Back our Economy and With it, Our Society: The ghettos are the undeveloped areas of our nation. Land is expensive. Labor is unskilled. Capital is nonexistent. No wonder the ghetto is left with marginal businesses or no business at all.

The cost of the ghettos is enormous. It is the cost of riots; the cost of increased police protection; the costs of lost purchasing power, lost profits, lost income and revenue. The fact is that the ghettos are a lost market, millions of people deep, and billions of dollars wide, and growing everyday.

The ghettos cry out for help.

The need is now.

The question is not whether we shall move but when. The question is not who is to blame, but how society shall act.

Footnotes at end of article.

MARKETING AND THE GHETTO: RESPONSE TO THE CHALLENGE

The ghettos need market development—

Business and industry located in the ghetto, creating an economic base, and giving residents jobs;

Capital investment by outside industries in ghetto-owned business, industry, and training ventures;

Training programs for workers, managers, and entrepreneurs;

New marketing mechanisms to get goods and services to the ghetto;

Advertising and merchandising techniques geared to ghetto residents.

Clearly, government can be of some assistance. Many public programs are already aimed at making life in the ghetto more bearable, and, more important, at eliminating the ghetto. Programs by the Department of Commerce, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and others stand ready and willing to work with communities, and the business community in addressing the overall problem.[3]

The courts can help create a safer environment in which to work. Strict endorsement of laws curbing unfair and deceptive practices, and truth-in-lending certainly can help.

But the private sector must be in the forefront. As Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, New York University psychologist and educator has pointed out, many ghetto residents have given up on government, the legal system, even the schools and churches. "Business and industry are our last hope," he says.[4]

Ladies and gentlemen, as I read the list of your Association's Committees, I realized what an important part the American Marketing Association could play as part of the private sector effort.

For among the many kinds of needs are needs for the skills and talents you Association members have—skills in market research; market education; consumer and industrial marketing; and for professional ethics and standards your Association stands for.

Let me raise some questions:

How do poor consumers differ from others in their consumption attitudes and habits? Do they do comparison shopping?

What brands do they buy and why? Market research could help us find out.

How can the poor best be taught what they need to know to make informed consumer choices? What do minority group suppliers need to know to enter "mainstream" stores? Market educators can help answer this question.

How can price competition be encouraged and unethical practices curbed? How can we get low-cost credit to the poor? Those who study standards and ethics can help us respond.

How can service and industry be attracted to the ghetto? How can minority group entrepreneurs "make it" in the mainstream? Consumer and industrial marketing experts are needed as a resource group.

These questions are but the beginning of a list the American Marketing Association can help us develop, and help guide us in answering.

The encouraging thing is that so many of you are already involved. Universities are beginning to act. Business is beginning to move. Both are starting to work with government; and more important yet, to join the community.

Experimental models are many. To name a few:

In market research, use of ghetto-based research firms, training of Negro employees as researchers. (Eastman Kodak);[5]

In Market education, use of mobile consumer education vans (Better Business Bureau);[6] technical advice on marketing techniques to food store suppliers (Jewell Tea Company);[7] sophisticated training and counseling the poor for jobs (MIND) (Methods of Intellectual Development);[8]

In consumer and industrial marketing; building buying power by hiring and training the poor for better jobs (National Alliance of Businessmen under the Chairmanship of Henry Ford II; Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing; Control Data, Minneapolis);[9] building the economy of the ghetto by establishing franchised businesses (Chicken Delight);[10] launching independent businesses (Aero-Jet General sponsoring a tent-making factory);[11] sending mobile retail units into the ghetto; establishing cooperatives in food and other goods.[12]

We are beginning to learn some significant things, though there still is much more to know.

We know working in the ghetto represents a new conception of business' role in society. To put it in the words of William S. Vaughn, Board Chairman of Eastman-Kodak, involvement in the ghetto represents doing "what we should do—keeping in mind our concurrent responsibilities to Kodak men and women, to our share owners, and to our customers—for the benefit of the people involved, and for the betterment of the community of which we are a part."[13]

We know it is different from the dole: To put it in the words of H. D. (Chad) McClellan of the Los Angeles-based Management Council for Merit Employment, it was either "go on paying $400 million a year in Los Angeles Welfare costs . . . or go down and take a realistic look at the potential worker in the slums."[14]

We know it can be profitable: Jewell Tea Company stores were almost untouched in the riots;[15] the Watts (Calif.) Manufacturing Company sponsored by Aero-Jet General is soon expected to make a profit.[16]

We know it takes training everyone—executives, personnel officers, line supervisors, and employees. The Super Market Institute has developed a course 250 top food industry executives and training personnel have taken.[17]

We know it takes communication with the community. Kodak's Business Development Corporation is one way. But every company should have a Community Relations Department, and an Advisory Committee made up of neighborhood residents.

We know it takes involvement with other groups and individuals working to fight poverty. Model Cities and Community Act Programs need your advice. The Urban Coalition needs your support. Legislators—Federal, State, and local can use your help. Legislation is now pending directly related to marketing and the ghetto. The Omnibus Housing bill has in it a riot insurance provision. My own "Domestic Food Assistance Act of 1968" calls for a coalition of public and private sectors to procure and distribute food in new ways. Support is needed for this and other anti-hunger measures. Finally, self-help organizations, like N.E.G.R.O., need your encouragement.[18]

In closing, I wish to draw an analogy. At one time the social problem of auto safety had business lined up on one side, government (both executive and legislative branches) on the other. I was part of that battle, and I know the vehemence with which industry said "it couldn't be done." Safety was simply too expensive, they said.

Social problems are as they are perceived. A recent article in the newspapers shows how the genius of the marketplace finally produced an insight. Auto manufacturers seemingly see something else in the auto safety issue today. Auto safety could be a new form of product differentiation, and a new kind of competition. Thus, in the coming year, American consumers will be offered cars safer to drive. The problem has not changed, but industry's perception has.

I would like to suggest that the same kind of idea can be applied to the relationship between marketing and the ghetto. The problem should not be viewed as a tug of war between government and industry. Rather, it must be viewed as a mutual challenge, one in which business and industry can and must take the lead, just as they have done in auto safety.

What is needed today in the urban ghettos is differentiation of methods, and some competition. The goal of the competition: domestic development, the development of the human and economic potential of the central city core. The methods to achieve this goal: No "one best way", but many, aimed at achieving the social and economic goal. Dozens of different combinations are possible—jobs, business formation, technical assistance alone, or together, residents, private sector, governmental programs alone or in combination.

You of the Marketing Association can no longer ignore the ghetto. You must become involved. The challenge is to change perceptions, to create, to innovate, to transform. The challenge is to change problems into opportunities.

I know you will join with those of us in government, and in the courts, as leaders of the response.

FOOTNOTES

[1] "Consumer Credit and the Poor," Hearing before the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, April 19, 1968, p. 2.

[2] Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 1968, pp. 274–5.

[3] See Riot Insurance, Hearings before the Senate Commerce Committee, Aug. 29, 1967, pp. 90–116 for descriptions of numerous models of government-business cooperation in meeting these needs.

[4] "What Business Can Do for the Negro," Nation's Business (October 1967), p. 67.

[5] Conversation with Company Regional Representative in New York, May 1968.

[6] Report, Denver, Colorado Better Business Bureau, 1968.

[7] Conversation with Company Executive, May, 1968.

[8] Fortune (January 1968), p. 159.

[9] Conversations with Department of Commerce and Executives, May, 1968.

[10] Conversation with Department of Commerce official, June, 1968.

[11] Fortune (January 1968), pp. 159–160.

[12] Office of Economic Opportunity, Community Action Program Consumer Action Program booklets, Washington, D.C.

[13] Kodak Faces the Urban Crisis," pamphlet, unpaged and undated.

[14] Business and the Urban Crisis, A Special Report by McGraw-Hill, 1968, p. C5.

[15] Conversation with Jewell Tea Company executive, May, 1968.

[16] Fortune (January 1968), p. 159.

[17] Report, Super Market Institute, Inc., 200 E. Ontario St., Chicago, Ill. 60611.

[18] See Peter Bailey, "N.E.G.R.O. Charts New Paths to Freedom," Ebony (April 1968).

U.S. RESPONSIBILITY TO ENCOURAGE GOOD WILL TOWARD RHODESIA

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, for more than 3 years now, this country has participated in an economic boycott of the friendly nation of Rhodesia. I have long considered this an outrageous and foolish policy.

I do not pass judgment on whether Rhodesia should be independent or whether she should continue her former relationship with Great Britain.

This, however, is a matter to be decided between the countries involved—Great Britain and Rhodesia. The American Government has no business inter-

fering in the matter, nor for that matter does the United Nations.

Aside from the hardships our policy has brought to the people of Rhodesia, we have put this country in a position where it could become involved in a war in Africa. Are we not already heavily enough involved in a war in Southeast Asia?

Mr. President, I am hopeful the new administration will make an early review of this country's unwise and dangerous actions toward Rhodesia and take the steps necessary to restore friendly ties with that nation which has done nothing more than emulate the United States by declaring its independence from Great Britain.

In a recent article, former Secretary of State Dean Atcheson outlines steps for a more responsible policy toward Rhodesia. I ask unanimous consent for that article, which is reprinted in the Richmond News Leader of January 15, 1969, to be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

IT IS OUR RESPONSIBILITY TO ENCOURAGE GOOD WILL TOWARD RHODESIA

(By Dean Acheson)

The Johnson Administration, like a tidy and conscientious housewife, will want to clean out rubbish, failures, and broken-down contraptions rather than leave them to embarrass the new tenant. There is no better place to start than with the Rhodesian policy, bought by the present occupant in an absent-minded moment from a smart salesman. It never did work; the salesman is trying desperately to escape from all connections with it; and to leave the old non-starter to clutter up the garage would be a scurvy trick. Putting this advice in the more sonorous phrases of statesmanship, the President would do well to recall Lord Rosebery's warning not to hover over the bones of dead policies.

Prime Minister Harold Wilson invented this policy in aid of Britain's retreat from empire in southern Africa. The Federation with Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland, which the British had induced Southern Rhodesia to join in 1953, having proved a failure, the British Parliament dissolved it. Northern Rhodesia was set up as the independent state of Zambia and Nyasaland as Malawi. Rhodesia which had long been self-governing and a participant at Commonwealth Conferences on a parity with self-governing dominions, expected to have its independence recognized, as had been done with other self-governing units. This seemed a purely formal step, since the country had never been governed, subsidized, taxed, or protected by Whitehall and had its own consular service abroad.

The British Government, however, balked, seeking to get from Rhodesia a guarantee of universal suffrage within the country. Rhodesian suffrage was, and is now, as ours had been throughout our early history, based on literacy and property qualifications, arising out of local conditions. There are no racial qualifications or discriminations for voting or civil rights. The population of Rhodesia, consisting of two hundred thousand whites and four million blacks, is nearly all made up of immigrants or their immediate descendants. Many of the blacks are still in a state of primitive neolithic culture. The condition of domestic tranquility prevailing in Rhodesia may be judged by the fact that the municipal police, as in Britain, perform their duties unarmed and the mandatory death penalty for armed insurrection has been abolished.

UNILATERAL ACTION

The Rhodesian Government, unable to agree with the Labour Government in London on a form for severing their political connection, accomplished it by unilateral declaration in 1965. At this point Mr. Wilson, finding that he had leverage for pressure on Rhodesia and no support at home for armed intervention, sought foreign help in coercing the country. For some time the Afro-Asian-Communist delegations at the United Nations had been nosing into Rhodesian affairs, as they had into South African, Portuguese-Angolan, and French African. British Conservative governments had repulsed their interest in Rhodesia as an intrusion into internal affairs, forbidden by the Charter. Now, however, Mr. Wilson reversed course and sought from the United Nations voluntary economic sanctions—the United Nations term for economic warfare—against Rhodesia to end its independence. The United States followed along in this Children's Crusade to universalize one-man-one-vote.

Voluntary sanctions proving ineffective, Mr. Wilson pressed to have them made mandatory. Here, however, a problem arose. Under the Charter of the United Nations mandatory sanctions could be invoked only when the Security Council should find that the offending state had committed or threatened to commit a breach of international peace and security. Rhodesia, of course, had done neither. In fact, it had done nothing except to announce that political ties between it and Britain had been ended. Britain could have decided to make war upon this rebel, as it had on the American Colonies when they took similar action; but the British people would not do so and the British government declined the opportunity. International peace and security remained unruffled.

Not, however, to the United Nations Security Council. In its view Rhodesia constituted a threat to the peace if the Security Council said that it did. The Council in attaching its own meaning to the words of the Charter takes Humpty-Dumpty's position toward words: "The question is, which is to be the master—that's all." So it pronounced Rhodesia a threat to the peace. If a theory was needed it was that Rhodesia's independence under its existing electoral system would so outrage the black dictatorships of Africa that they might attack her. This theory has the authority of the wolf in Aesop's fable who declared that his prospective dinner, the lamb drinking downstream from him, was polluting his water.

MATTER OF SANCTIONS

Mandatory sanctions proved no more effective than voluntary ones in bringing Rhodesia to heel; nor has a later attempt to add to them. White Rhodesians have been brought together rather than divided by external pressure and have proved most ingenious in using great resources and industrial capacity to meet the needs of their beset economy. The blacks within Rhodesia have proved preponderantly cooperative rather than reluctant toward the regime. The countries around Rhodesia, black and white, furnish copious leaks through the blockade; practical operators like the French are not deterred from a profitable bargain by so bogus an international obligation as UN sanctions. They are a failure; and yet they are harmful, more than a nuisance. No one knows this better than Mr. Wilson, who now wants desperately to get out of the mess he has created.

The sanctions, like many ill-considered policies, are hurting unintended victims and bringing about unintended results. The chief economic victims now appear to be black people—within Rhodesia through underemployment and a slowdown in growth; in Zambia (formerly Northern Rhodesia), which since independence, as during the Federation, is economically dependent upon the Rhodesian market, by decreasing its market for labor and materials. Zambia is already asking Britain for large subsidies to compensate for the harm done to her—a development which partly explains Mr. Wilson's change of heart and mind about sanctions.

Perhaps the greatest damage is the political and psychological estrangement and distraction from constructive purposes caused by this UN-created isolation of southern Africa, both black and white. The Rhodesians, already remote from western civilization, feel at bay, conspired against by declared enemies, the target of foreign trained and equipped terrorists, pushed toward a racial attitude they do not share and do not want. This view is thoroughly shared by Dr. Hastings Banda, the president of Malawi, who has seen that his country's future welfare lies in closer cooperation with his highly developed white neighbors to the south and speaks as hostilely of UN sanctions as does Mr. Smith.

AFRICA STALEMATE

Mr. Wilson is rightly—though only lately—aware of the ugly consequences of a stalemate in southern Africa. At home Conservatives, Liberals, and moderate Labour are sick of the situation and want to get out of it. The extreme left joins the Afro-Asian and Communist blocks in calling for majority rule before independence in Rhodesia and some of them, for force—by someone else—to achieve it. South Africa has announced a policy of support for its neighbors against terrorism or attack by or through adjoining states. The United Nations policy is thus, ironically, the chief threat to the peace and security of southern and central Africa.

Mr. Wilson not only wants to get out of the trouble he has made but also has gone a good way to do so. The trouble is that he has not gone far enough. The scheme which, in various versions, he offers involves the fatal flaw of contraditions. Let us see how this is so.

In Mr. Wilson's last talks with Mr. Smith on the HMS Fearless a few weeks ago, the British Prime Minister was apparently ready to acknowledge Rhodesian independence if Mr. Smith's Government would take two steps designed to save some face for Mr. Wilson and appease the more reasonable of the black Commonwealth states. These steps were meant to safeguard the "entrenched clauses" of the Rhodesian Constitution that permit persons of certain cultural and economic qualifications to vote and all persons to have other civil rights without racial discrimination. The first of these safeguards is called the "blocking quarter." It would require in the Constitution that a quarter plus one of each legislative chamber should be composed of black members elected by black voters and that no alteration of the entrenched causes could be made over the adverse vote of one quarter of the votes of both houses voting together.

The blocking quarter would thus keep open the increasing political power of black citizens as they attained cultural and economic qualification.

The second requirement put forward was to include in the Constitution a right of appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in London in a number of ways, against any change in the entrenched clauses, even though approved by all racial groups, "on the ground that it discriminates unjustly, or has the effect of discriminating unjustly, between the races; or on the grounds that it derogates from the principles of the Declaration of Rights contained in the Constitution." The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is an agency of the British government composed of the members of Britain's highest court, the Judicial Committee of the House of Lords plus the Lord President of the Council and a few others. At one time appeals lay to it from colonial and dominion courts. The provision for appeals has now been abolished by

the independent members of the Commonwealth as inconsistent with an independent status.

The British requirement for an appeal to its judicial agency for dependent areas is the chief block to settlement between Rhodesia and the United Kingdom. It would give the British Privy Council the same power over Rhodesian legislation claimed to violate the entrenched clauses as our Supreme Court has over state legislation claimed to violate the Fourteenth Amendment.

Rhodesia's objections to this double-locking device have been stated clearly and—at least in my judgment—persuasively by Ian Smith. He stresses that the principle of the blocking quarter is acceptable. What is not acceptable is the provision for appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. In his words, "the British Government wishes to assume additional powers which are a derogation from the sovereignty of our Rhodesian Parliament." He embellishes the point: "For example, if a certain entrenched clause amendment, which requires a three-quarter majority . . . in its favor, complied with this necessary requirement, indeed even if such an amendment received the approval of every single member . . . in other words 100 per cent support, the Privy Council would still be in a position to turn this down and proclaim that in their opinion the Rhodesian Parliament had not made the correct political decision . . . and therefore had no right to pass the amendment." Mr. Smith concludes: "In other words, the British Government is insisting that the Privy Council shall be the highest parliament in Rhodesia as far as amendments to entrenched clauses are concerned, and that they shall take on the role of deciding what laws are in the interest of Rhodesia." Thus the British terms for acknowledging Rhodesian independence would include a denial of that independence—a basic contradiction.

Following the Fearless talks, Mr. Wilson sent an able minister, Mr. George Thomson, to negotiate further at Salisbury in what was touted to be an effort to try for agreement with Rhodesia. Mr. Thomson tried out numerous variations on the same theme: to wit, some device whereby the British Government would be enabled to withhold independence even while appearing to acquiesce in it. Mr. Smith, sensibly and understandably, has persistently rejected the contradiction. Thus, not surprisingly, the issue is stalled, while the Rhodesians go on exercising in practice the independence that the British Government seems so loath to admit candidly. This stalement opens up a prospect for more tumbling along a demonstrably futile course—months upon months of sanctions that miss their purpose and serve only mischief.

What can the United States do to help in the situation? First of all, our government might take heed—and call on the British likewise to take heed—of Shakespeare's advice that:

"To persist
In doing wrong extenuates not wrong,
But makes it much more heavy."

It is fallacious and fanatic to believe that any good can be achieved by turning the screw of sanctions.

In a similar spirit, we can take note of the good sense in Ian Smith's position—reavowed on November 19—which subscribes to the blocking quarter but rejects, as an "impossible and indeed ridiculous obstacle," the notion of putting his country in leading strings to Britain by making the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council the constitutional censor.

ROOM FOR SETTLEMENT

Within this position there is surely room for a fair settlement: for Mr. Wilson, opportunity to escape from a quandary of his own making without leaving too many of his tail feathers in the door jamb; for Mr. Smith, an end of the enervating struggle for independence at the price of a fair guarantee in the Constitution for the continuance of the rights it provides.

We can help Mr. Wilson where he needs it most—with his extremists at home and with the United Nations—by supporting a settlement in which Mr. Smith grants the blocking quarter and Mr. Wilson drops the demand for an appeal to a foreign court. Our method could be to let Mr. Wilson know of the desire of the American administration to end its domestic enforcement of restrictions on trade with Rhodesia, preferably in conjunction with similar action by the United Kingdom, rather than to leave the mess to be cleaned up by the incoming administration.

This action would also have the incidental advantage of being right. In both the broad and the narrow sense of the word the United States will bear the responsibility for a continuance of this mistaken quarrel with Rhodesia—and secondarily with South Africa and Portugal—by continuing encouragement of measures taken in the United Nations. Although sanctions against Rhodesia have failed, they would have amounted to nothing had we not cut off our trade with that country. For us and, hopefully, the British to resume it would, as a practical matter, end the policy.

In a broader sense, however, we will bear responsibility for the growing political isolation of southern Africa which these emotional and ill-considered measures are bringing about. We are the only power of general, as distinguished from parochial, responsibility in the free world. At a time when Arab nationalism has brought on the closing of the Suez Canal perhaps permanently—and the Soviet navy has penetrated the eastern Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean, the good will of southern Africa, the use of its ports, the cooperation of its governments—including their participation with immense resources and advanced technology in aiding the development of adjoining black states—would be of immense importance to the free world. The mere existence of stability in so vast and important an area of an otherwise turbulent continent is an asset of the greatest value. As the principal responsible power in the free world, it is our duty and responsibility to encourage good will, cooperation, and stability in southern Africa. It is the height of folly to sacrifice these desirable ends to an aggressive reformist intervention in the internal affairs of these states, an intervention designed to force upon them electoral practices that none of black African or Communist states and few of the Asians accept.

THE UKRAINE

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, January 22 marked two highly significant anniversaries for a loyal and dedicated group of Americans. That day was the 51st anniversary of the Independence of the Ukraine and the 50th anniversary of the act of union of the Ukraine.

These two events took place exactly a year apart in the city of Kiev, the capital of the Ukraine. The freedom loving Ukrainian people were soon set upon by the Soviet Union, however, and their independence crushed.

Despite living under Communist dictatorship these people have not lost their longing for liberty and freedom. To them it is more than a motto or dream. It is an active cause which they promote and foster; often at the risk of their very lives.

During World War II they fought bravely to disrupt and expel Nazi invaders. Later, they continued their efforts to overthrow the Communist tyranny. Through these efforts, they have struggled alone.

They have neither given up nor lost sight of their goal, however. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a letter I received from Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., in Fargo, N. Dak., and an article which was written by Mr. George Weller of the Chicago Daily News Service last fall. This article was carried by Svobada, the Ukrainian weekly on September 21, 1968, and carefully details the continuing contributions these brave people are making to the freedom of mankind.

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

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, INC.
Fargo, N. Dak., January 16, 1969.

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
U.S. Senator,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: January 22nd will mark the 51st Anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of the Ukrainian National Republic and the Golden Anniversary of the Act of Union, whereby all Ukrainian lands were united into one independent and sovereign state of Ukrainian Nation. The Independence of Ukraine was proclaimed in Kiev, the capitol of Ukraine on January 22nd 1918 and the Act of Union took place one year later, on January 22nd 1919, also in Kiev.

The Ukrainian National Republic was recognized by a number of foreign Governments including that of Soviet Russia. The latter, however, almost simultaneously with the recognition, declared war and began a large scale invasion of Ukraine. For almost 3½ years the Ukrainian people waged a gallant struggle in defense of their country, alone and unaided. The free Ukraine was subdued to a puppet regime of the Soviet Socialistic Republic.

The freedom loving people of Ukraine have not accepted the Soviet-Russian domination and have been fighting for the re-establishment of their independence by all means accessible to them for the past 50 years.

During World War II the Ukrainian people organized a powerful underground resistance movement known as the Ukrainian Partisan Army (UPA) which fought not only against the Naxi regime but against the Soviets as well. Stalin and Khrushchev unleashed a bloody persecution and reprisals against the Ukrainian people in the late 1940's. Relentless and harsh persecution of the Ukrainians continued after the death of Stalin and after the ouster of Khrushchev from the top leadership in the Kremlin. The Brezhnev-Kosygin leadership is bent on keeping the Soviet-Russian Empire intact by persecution and deportation of Ukrainian youth and Ukrainian intellectuals. Over 200 young Ukrainian University professors, poets, writers, scientists, lawyers, literary critics and radio-TV commentators were arrested recently on charges of anti-Soviet propaganda. Recently the International and U.S. Press has been providing a vast amount of documentation on the suppression of the Ukrainian culture.

Briefly the Kremlin rule in Ukraine can be described as follows:

Exploitation of Ukraine's economic resources for the benefit of Moscow and its imperialistic ventures in Asia, Africa, and Latin American

Genocide and systemic deportation of Ukrainians to central Asia

Arrest and trials of Ukrainian patriots defending freedom of their country.

Terror and assassination of Ukrainian leaders outside of Ukraine

Persecution of all religions in Ukraine

Enforced Russification aiming at the cultural and linguistic genocide of the Ukrainian people.

All the available evidence of the western observers shows that the ever-increasing tempo of repression has failed to intimidate the Ukrainian people and the Russian leadership in the Kremlin feared that Ukraine would actively support the liberal movement of their satellite country of Czechoslovakia. Since the Kremlin leaders were convinced the liberal ideas of Czechoslovakia would help the Ukrainian liberals and other Captive Nations.

Both the U.S. Congress and the President of the United States have expressed their concern over the captive non-Russian nations in the USSR by enacting the "Captive Nations Week Resolution" in July 1959.

The Ukrainian-American community in our state and in the whole United States will observe the forthcoming fifty-first Anniversary of the Ukrainian Independence and the 50th Anniversary of the Act of Union in fitting and solemn celebration.

Therefore, since it is almost 75 years that Ukrainians came to our state and made a substantial contribution to its development, we kindly request that you attend the ceremonies in commemoration of this anniversary and make your statement on that day. This anniversary provides an appropriate occasion not only for the U.S. Government and American people but the free world to demonstrate their sympathy and understanding of the aspiration of the Ukrainian people.

We extend our sincere thanks and appreciation for the favorable response in the past on this and other matter and we hope you will continue to help the Ukrainian Nation.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President, UCCA, State Branch of North Dakota.

[From Svoboda, the Ukrainian Weekly, Sept. 21, 1968]

UKRAINE IS KEY TO CZECH INVASION PLOT, SAYS CHICAGO NEWSMAN

(NOTE.—The following article, datelined in Bucharest, Rumania, was written by George Weller, of the Chicago Daily News Service. It was reprinted by several major dailies in this country).

In the unfinished puzzle of why Russia crushed Czechoslovakia the missing clue to Soviet motivation is the Ukraine.

The Ukraine is nominally independent and provides one of Russia's two extra votes in the United Nations. But the Ukraine is at once Moscow's greatest prize and her worst internal worry.

The 46 million Ukrainians are rich-blooded southerners, wealthy in lands and oil, climate and culture.

Stifling Czech liberalism is important because it infects the East Germans, Poles, Hungarians and even the stolid Bulgarians.

But in the wild blood of the Ukrainians, freedom, if allowed to spread, could mean revolution. It could even mean that the right of secession, which the Soviet constitution guarantees, could be realized. From the Ukraine, the disease of "independent socialism" could pass to the other 14 Soviet Republics.

Russia, to prevent this infection from spreading eastward, sliced off the eastern end of Czechoslovakia in 1945. The border was changed first, to give the Red Army direct access to Czechoslovakia, instead of having to pass across Catholic Poland and Catholic Hungary. And secondly, all the Ukrainians living in free Czechoslovakia were put into the Soviet Ukraine. The aim here was to prevent any cross-border infection.

To make the break perfect, the Ukrainian Catholic priests, were compelled to join the Ukrainian Orthodox priesthood.

It was disturbing to the Soviets to observe how in mid-August President Ludvig Svoboda received the allegiance of the Catholic Bishops of Czechoslovakia for "the new course."

When the crunch came in the Kremlin, the two strongest voices demanding a takeover of Czechoslovakia were both Ukrainians.

The loudest was the Ukrainian who stood to lose his job if Czech communism spread east: Piotr Shelest, secretary of the Ukrainian party. It is he who must even now try to explain away the imprisonments of Ukrainian intellectuals.

At the Cierna meeting between the two Presidiums, Czech and Soviet, Shelest was so vicious in his takeoff speech that the whole Czechoslovak Presidium walked out.

The hardest-nosed interventionist on the military side was another Ukrainian, Marshal Andrei Grechko. It was he who pleaded that if Czechoslovakia were permitted its liberalization, he no longer could guarantee the Soviet line of communications.

The Ukraine is still suffering from the "writers' disease" which sparked last spring's revolt in the Czechoslovak Communist Party. At least 200 Ukrainian writers and scientists have been arrested and tried in secret.

An idealist and daring television reporter, Viacheslav Chornovil, 30, was assigned last year to cover the trials of youths found guilty of reading unauthorized literature. He smuggled details of their hearings out of the Ukraine. Chornovil was arrested in November, given a secret trial and sentenced to a Ukrainian labor camp.

Pro-Soviet Ukrainians, like Shelest and Grechko, saw in these methods the right cure to be applied in Czechoslovakia, too. A quick dose of armor may save not only Czechoslovakia, but the adjoining priceless Ukraine, as they see it.

By the standards of past handling of the Ukrainian Communists, this Soviet takeover is relatively mild. In 1937 a group of liberal Ukrainian Communists, forerunners of the Dubcek stamp, opposed Josef Stalin's Greater-Russian policy. He, a Georgian, seemed to be leading the Soviet Republics where Hitler, an Austrian, was leading the German states, toward a new imperialism.

So stirred were they that they managed to convince a majority of the full plenum of all the 15 Soviet Republics. Stalin was in danger of a vote of censure.

Stalin invited the whole dissenting Ukrainian Presidium to the Kremlin for "consultations," had them arrested by the secret police and shot.

ADMINISTRATION OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, a very thought-provoking study proposing changes in the administration of Indian affairs has recently been brought to my attention. This report was prepared by Mr. Wendell Chino, who is currently serving as president of the Mescalero Apache Tribe, president of the National Congress of American Indians, and chairman of the New Mexico Commission on Indian Affairs. Mr. Chino is very knowledgeable in the area of Indian affairs, and I believe my colleagues will find his views on the subject enlightening.

The recommendations presented in the study, I believe, deserve our careful attention at this time when the problems confronting the American Indian are becoming increasingly evident and demand immediate and effective action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this report printed at this point in the RECORD for the further enlightenment of my colleagues.

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

INDIAN VIEWS ON ADMINISTRATION OF INDIAN AFFAIRS DURING THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION

(By Wendell Chino, president, Mescalero Apache Tribe; president, National Congress of American Indians; chairman, New Mexico Commission on Indian Affairs)

As the President of the Mescalero Apache Tribe, the President of the National Congress of American Indians, and the Chairman of the New Mexico Commission on Indian Affairs, I would like to project several personal views and ideas that I have concerning the Federal administration of Indian affairs during the coming and subsequent Administrations.

The appointment of Mr. Robert L. Bennett by President Johnson, as the Commissioner of Indian Affairs has made many positive contributions to the Indian well being! It is to the interest of the coming Administration, the interest of the Country and the interest of the Indian people that Mr. Bennett be retained as the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

The creation of the National Council on Indian Opportunity by President Johnson was a milestone in the involvement of Indian people with the administration of this Country, and as such it can be a vital mechanism for Indian involvement in their own progress. There is no other like body which gives the Indian people such vital participation in the discussion and solution of their problems. The National Council on Indian Opportunity must be continued and funds appropriated for its continued operation.

There is no question about the desirability of appointing an Indian of recognized ability to the Indian Claims Commission. This should have a high priority in the coming Administration.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs for a long period of time has handled matters involving Indian people. After a fair consideration of all the issues involved, I believe that the Bureau of Indian Affairs has, in good conscience, attempted to carry out its programs and functions, but I believe that the time has now arrived to take a long and analytical look at this Bureau.

The abolition or dispersal of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and all of its services among other government agencies certainly is not the answer. We believe that the Bureau of Indian Affairs can effectively perform its present duties if the organization is revised. It has the experience and know-how that is required.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs should, by legislation, be made an independent commission or agency. At the present time, the Bureau of Indian Affairs must compete for funds with other agencies and bureaus within the Department of Interior who are also the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior. The Department of Interior is basically a land oriented organization, rather than a human oriented organization. The Department's Budget Managers are also land oriented. They do not have the required empathy regarding basic Indian problems which are human in nature, such as the community problems of education, housing, etc. The Secretary of the Interior often finds himself hamstrung by the Department and other interests which are more interested in other areas. This conflict of interest at the Secretarial level cannot contribute to the fair and impartial administration of Indian affairs.

The very bureaucratic structure of the Bu-

reau of Indian Affairs insulates the Secretary of the Interior from the Indian people. The Secretary's chief representative of the Indian people, the Commissioner of Indian affairs, is also further insulated from the people by the Area Offices. With these insulations, it is no small wonder that many critics of the Bureau of Indian Affairs claim that the job is not being done, and that top heavy administration results. Limited funds are now being wasted on useless office support, which also breeds excessive red tape and reporting requirements. Direct access to the top administrators is needed. The establishment of an independent Indian Commission will remove most of the bureaucracy that makes it so cumbersome for Indian people to communicate with those who are responsible for Indian Affairs. I believe that this proposed Indian Commission will be more responsive to the Indian people and speed the day when full scale development can be implemented in Indian communities.

An Associate or Deputy Commissioner should be incorporated into this Indian Commission who should have the prime responsibility for the affairs and problems of the Indians in urban areas. The proper and wholesome adjustment of the urban Indians to an urban environment is most essential if off-Reservation employment is to be encouraged.

I would recommend the establishment of a committee or commission to study the operation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Included in this body should be a broad representation of responsible reservation Indian leadership. One of the primary tasks of this body should be a complete study and evaluation of the present Bureau of Indian Affairs budget process. The present process has built-in pitfalls which not only encourage, but promote and nourish the building of empires by bureaucratic Branch Chiefs through their control of funds, promotions, etc. at the Central, Area and Agency levels.

I believe that funds appropriated by the Congress for the benefit of Indians and Indian Tribes should be appropriated with broad discretionary powers for their use given to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and especially to the Agency Superintendent. The present line-item-functional appropriations result in waste for some functions through an over abundance of funds while other necessary functions are curtailed because of fund limitations. The revision of the budget process should also include the approval or the veto power by Tribal governing bodies during the local Agency budget submittal process.

The funds which are now required and presently being utilized to maintain Bureau of Indian Affairs Area Offices should be given to the Tribal governing bodies for use in contracting for specific professional services and technical advice needed on their Reservations. If these funds can not be given to Indian Tribes directly, the funds should be placed under the direct control of the Agency Superintendent to fulfill the same objectives, i.e., contract for private professional services desired by the Tribes and subject to Indian leadership approval.

The Indian Agencies at Reservation level should be reorganized, taking into account local needs and the total Reservation development programs. The present Bureau structure, which calls for an Agency Branch to complement every Washington Branch Chief, whether it is essentially needed or not should be eliminated. The local Agencies should be revamped to include an effective combination of facilities and services urgently and ultimately needed to achieve the human resource, natural resource and economic developments in the Indian Community.

I have some reservations about Indian Tribes contracting to perform services for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In many cases, Indian Tribes do not have the necessary capital to contract to perform these services. If Indian Tribes are to be encouraged to contract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the necessary working capital and equipment must be made available on an outright grant basis to permit the Tribe to function economically. It should be specifically understood that if Indian Tribes are to contract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, that a fair return by the Tribes is to be expected and that the Tribes should not be expected to pay sub-standard wages to perform these services. Also, the Tribes should be offered not only the dirtiest, smallest and most difficult jobs which the Agency must accomplish, but Tribes should be encouraged to accept major tasks that may require them to develop their own staffs of skilled experts. In many instances, Tribes are offered just those jobs that the Bureau of Indian Affairs has never been able to successfully accomplish, or those which the Bureau of Indian Affairs does not want to be bothered with.

If Indian Tribes with very little capital contract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs this contracting could bankrupt them unless payment procedures by the Bureau are improved. Further, the failure of Congress to give continuity of appropriations for Indian contract programs and developments could leave Indian Contractors with costly, but unusable equipment. Excessive contract supervision and red tape requirements should also be kept in check if Indian Tribes are to be expected to contract successfully.

We have many years to go before the Indian people and their communities reach optimum development; therefore, any thoughts of abolishing or parceling out the services of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to other Federal agencies is out of the question at this time. If another Federal agency attempted to take over one of the present functions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs that agency would have to learn the difficult task and would be faced with the same problems which the Bureau of Indian Affairs faces. We suggest that the change of the present Area-Agency system is the most expedient route to take.

If the Bureau of Indian Affairs is abolished or its services fragmented it will again jeopardize, and in many cases it will terminate the present services of the Federal government. It will be termination in disguise. Indian people have *never* been successful in competing for services through other government agencies, and the services received from these agencies have been very small or practically nil except for the excellent services now received from the Economic Development Administration and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Politically and socially it is almost impossible for the Indian to compete for services among other Federal agencies. With the huge backlog of services and developments needing to be accomplished, at best, the parceling out of Bureau of Indian Affairs services to other Federal agencies would only be an injustice to these agencies because of their already insurmountable work load. A revamped and revitalized Bureau of Indian Affairs with sufficient funds can and will do a better job!

These are views and opinions that I have developed during my years of observation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs while in the service of my people on our Mescalero Indian Reservation. I respectfully submit them for your consideration in your deliberations during the coming years.

STAN THE MAN ELECTED TO BASEBALL HALL OF FAME

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, on Tuesday, January 21, 1969, Stan Musial was voted into the Baseball Hall of Fame. Although U.S. Senators are seldom at a loss for lavish words, I must truly confess that Stan Musial's illustrious career speaks better and with more convincing eloquence than any words I could utter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following editorials from leading Missouri newspapers relating to Stan's election to the Hall of Fame be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Jan. 22, 1969]

CONGRATULATIONS, STAN

Stan Musial has entered baseball's Hall of Fame with the same ease he inscribed his name tall in major league record books. It is a fitting tribute to the former Cardinal great that he was voted a member of baseball's shrine the first year he became eligible, a feat accomplished by only three other men since the first election in 1936.

Stan the Man is a living legend of baseball. The outfielder-first baseman of the Cardinals for 22 seasons set 50 National League records during his playing career, which ended with his retirement five years ago. He added to his sporting laurels by serving as general manager of the world champion Redbirds in 1967, then becoming senior vice president of the Cardinals.

Musial, now 48, is a prosperous businessman and a prominent, highly respected citizen of the community. But he will always be remembered best as the Cardinals' superstar and one of baseball's all-time heroes, a reputation which has been enhanced by his selection to the Hall of Fame.

Congratulations, Stan! You richly deserve the reward—not only for outstanding athletic ability but for being a true sportsman and gentleman on and off the playing field.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Jan. 23, 1969]

NO PLAYERS MORE WORTHY THAN STAN AND CAMPY

Stan Musial and Roy Campanella have now been voted into the Hall of Fame, that final tribute to the stars who have made baseball the grand sport that it is. At first glance, the two designees might seem to have little in common. Actually there are numerous similarities between Campanella and Musial, although they were all-out competitors who played on opposing teams whose rivalry dominated a decade.

Both men were extraordinary performers of great consistency. On three occasions each was named the most valuable player in the National League. But in the more human sense, both Musial and Campanella were, and remain, smiling, optimistic men who accepted fame and the adulation of the fans in sincerely humble manner. For most Missourians, and for countless others across the nation, Stan the Man was the foremost sports figure of the postwar era. As Joe McGuff suggested in his "Sporting Comment" column yesterday, it is difficult to imagine how anyone involved in the election process could have left Musial off his ballot. But a few did, so the selection of Musial was not unanimous as it deserved to have been.

An especially poignant drama was added to Campanella's brilliant performance at bat and behind the plate. A traffic accident ended his playing career and left him an invalid. His marriage collapsed and his stepson went to jail. Yet through it all, Campy remained cheerful and thankful for the opportunities that had come his way.

The Hall of Fame is crowded with tributes to the legendary figures of our national pasttime. Ruth, Williams, Cobb and many others have won their places there. But none mer-

ited that recognition any more than Musial and Campanella. On and off the field, both men were exemplary in every way. Their addition to the Hall of Fame makes that zenith of baseball's honors even more distinguished.

[From the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press, Jan. 23, 1969]

STAN'S THE MAN

The selection of Stan Musial to baseball's Hall of Fame was an expected occurrence. If anything, it is perhaps somewhat disappointing that 23 members of the Baseball Writers Association didn't vote for his admission.

Musial, the former St. Louis Cardinal great, received 317 of a possible 340 votes.

One wonders just where these 23 writers spent the greater part of the 1941–1963 period. Perhaps they're soccer enthusiasts, or prefer bull-fighting.

It's difficult to understand how anyone familiar with baseball could bypass Musial. He won seven National League batting titles, three times was named Most Valuable Player, and led the Cardinals to four pennants and three world championships while establishing more than 50 records.

And the personal life of Musial was every bit as exemplary as his performance on the field. No one ever seemed to have a critical word about the Cardinal great.

It's good to know Stan Musial will now be officially inducted into the Hall of Fame later this year.

HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS—XIV

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, we, as Americans, are proud of saying that we value the dignity and worth of the individual. We delight in pointing to the Declaration of Independence and quoting the lines concerning our "unalienable rights," as human beings. Due to our heritage, we see human rights as those rights to which every man and woman is entitled, by virtue of the fact that he or she is a human being. We have dedicated this Nation, through our Constitution and laws, to the support of human rights for all people, in this Nation and throughout the world. Yet, as we pursue this goal, that support is sometimes marked by rhetoric and not by deeds.

We have now before us a means to give action to words and reality to ideas. President Kennedy in 1963 sent to this body the Convention on Political Rights for Women. The Human Rights Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee carefully examined this convention, listened to exhaustive testimony, and favorably reported this convention and others to the full committee. Unfortunately, this convention has not been acted upon.

It is past time that the Senate as a whole demonstrated its positive intentions in this matter. Inaction is tantamount to negative action in the area of women's political rights, and in the broader area of human rights. Let us not by further inaction allow one of President Kennedy's favorite quotations, from Dante's "Inferno," apply to us; namely:

The hottest places in hell are reserved for those who in a period of moral crisis maintained their neutrality.

I submit that this is a time of crisis, when our words are questioned and demonstrations of our good will are demanded. We should act now. Let us add action to our words, and ratify the Convention on the Political Rights of Women without further delay.

LIFE ON WELFARE

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, welfare is one of the most perplexing and frustrating problems in our Nation.

Welfare is intrinsically linked with problems of housing, jobs, education, and health.

An article by Julius Horowitz in the January 26, 1969, issue of the New York Times magazine makes this point with great clarity and force. It is entitled "A Portrait of New York's Welfare Population: In 1 Month, 50,000 Persons Were Added to the City's Welfare Rolls." Mr. Horowitz, a skilled journalist and novelist, has probed beyond the statistics and administrative problems. The people on welfare describe, in their own words, the situations that led them to apply for welfare, and their life as welfare recipients.

Mr. Horowitz has increased our understanding of the human factors, which must always be in our thoughts as we consider changes in the present welfare system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be inserted in the RECORD.

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

A PORTRAIT OF NEW YORK'S WELFARE POPULATION: IN 1 MONTH, 50,000 PERSONS WERE ADDED TO THE CITY'S WELFARE ROLLS

(By Julius Horowitz)

Until the present decade the welfare population in New York City and throughout the nation was invisible to most of America. Occasionally a mink-coat scandal would create some excitement, but the scandals never excited the general population to the extent that it began to view people on welfare as living beings. Welfare was a place for the living dead.

A New York State welfare study published in 1961 made the alarming (then) prediction that 703,150 persons would be receiving welfare throughout this state by 1970. The study also estimated that statewide welfare costs would reach a high of $536,665,000 by 1970. In fact, the current welfare budget in New York City alone is $1.4-billion. By now, or within a few weeks at most, it is estimated that one million persons are, or will be, on welfare in the city. This is a population more than twice as large as Buffalo, the second largest city in New York State. It is larger than 15 American states.

In 1965, the welfare population in New York City was increasing at a steady average rate of 4,956 a month. In 1966, the average began a rise to 8,311. In 1967, the increase leaped to 14,284 persons a month.

Last August, the 40 Social Service Centers in New York City received 23,996 applications for public assistance. Of these, the Department of Social Services accepted 21,506—or a total of more than 50,000 human beings*. Who are these new 50,000 welfare recipients, why did they come onto the rolls during a time of supposedly unruffled affluence?

The 50,000 new persons added to the welfare population in August were accepted from the following applications: Home Relief, 10,867 cases; Aid to Dependent Children (A.D.C.), 8,292 applications; Temporary Aid to Dependent Children, 1,060; Blind Assistance, 44; Aid to the Disabled, 1,660; Old Age Assistance, 2,073. Of the 50,000, about half were children.

FOR SOME, WELFARE IS A "BANK"

The traditional pattern of welfare as a form of paternalism began to change with the influx of low-income Puerto Rican families in the nineteen-forties and fifties. They used welfare as an economic stabilizer, a guaranteed income in case low-paying restaurant, hotel, nursing-home, hospital, garment-industry jobs could not support a family, or if the exorbitant rents in the West Side slums ate up the take-home pay. They paid little attention to the caseworkers. They saw welfare as a source of money, nothing else.

Similarly, the low-income Negro families who come to New York City from the South in search of the American experience of opportunity use welfare as a "bank." They know that they have "on deposit" in New York City enough money to take care of them—to compensate for the lack of jobs, the lack of enough money on a job.

In a welfare center on 14th Street off Fifth Avenue, a Negro man of 20, waiting to see his caseworker, told me: "I don't find welfare a shame. I paid my taxes even if they didn't believe it in Alabama. I heard about welfare being a kind of bank in New York. This is only tax money they're giving out. I lost my job at $85 a week. I can make out on the $66 they give me every two weeks. It really worked like a bank when I applied at the end of July. I filled out an application no more complicated than a short income-tax form, and that same day they gave me money for rent and food because my money ran out."

New York City is an open city: No passport or identity card is required to take up residence. As a result, it is almost impossible to measure the so-called in-migration to New York from the South and Puerto Rico. At best, there are only estimates and they are dated. From 1960 to 1965, according to the Community Renewal Program, the net addition of nonwhites in New York City was 154,120 persons; the net addition of Puerto Ricans was 36,692—and the out-migration of whites was 450,115. But these are estimates based on population projections—not hard data.

Nor is there any way of knowing how many of these in-migrants are motivated by the higher welfare payments in the North. But the hard fact is that while Mississippi, for example, estimates that a family of four requires $201 a month to meet basic needs, including rent, Mississippi actually pays an A.D.C. family of four only $55—meeting 27 per cent of the family's basic needs. Alabama has a similar standard of $177 a month, but pays $89. New York, where living costs are higher, pays 100 per cent of the budget deficit—an average of $278 a month for a family of four, including rent. It is a situation that prompted a task force appointed by President Nixon to recommend that the Federal Government set uniform minimum standards and take over a larger share of the costs.

I went out to talk to men who had made the migration. On a stoop on West 103d Street I found Mr. Williams, who came to New York from Georgia in 1959, and found himself on welfare in August, 1968. He said to me, "You don't want to go up to my room. Some junkie might hit you over the head. They stole all my clothes when I came out of the hospital."

"What did they take?"

"They took three shirts, two pants, one pair of shoes, six pairs of underwear, tops and bottoms, a razor, a comb. They left me one dirty pair of underwear. The shoes were

* During the same month, the department closed out 12,522 cases for such reasons as reclassification to other welfare categories, whereabouts unknown, refusal to comply with departmental policy, employment. Thus, the net increase was 8,984 cases, representing 20,301 individuals—an annual rate of increase of 243,612.

brand-new. They cost me $14.81. But I've also got some clothes in pawn. They're out in Long Island. When the pawn shops closed in Harlem during what I call the so-called riots—they weren't the real riots—my clothes went there. You can't find a pawnshop now in Harlem; they're closing up."

"What do you need from welfare?" I asked.

"Mostly money to get my clothes out of pawn." Mr. Williams took a card out of his wallet and showed me a job referral he had as a messenger for a Madison Avenue firm. "I'm supposed to go to work on Tuesday," he said. "I want to go on the new job looking like a gentleman. I don't have to take the job, you know. I can stay on welfare. But I want to see how they treat me, if they give me the money I really need to get back to work. I don't want to become a welfare addict."

"Why did you come to New York?" I asked.

"I got tired of segregation. I wanted free movement. You've got to leave the South to be free. But that doesn't mean the North is better than the South. You don't see welfare kids running around the South like crazy, not knowing who they belong to, or thinking they can rob or beat up whoever they see first on the street. You don't see kids on drugs in the South.

"Without being prejudiced, my own people turn on themselves in the North. They use the so-called freedom up here to rob from one another. In the South they call New York a gravy train. A woman here with three kids on welfare calls up her sister in Georgia with five kids and says, 'Come up here where the welfare is better.' It's not better, it's just more money to buy the same things you get in the South for less money, and here with the extra money you get the pimps, the dope, the killings, the robberies.

"A lot of people come here full of frustrations, they get lost in freedom here, they run wild, till a man who wants to live a clean life has to run away from his own people. Well, welfare adds to this crazy kind of freedom, but anybody is crazy if they think they'll find freedom on welfare."

Thomas Edwards, 26, came to New York from Mississippi. When I met him he was wearing a Harris tweed jacket, neat gray slacks, a button-down white shirt, a striped tie. He wore black-rimmed glasses, and had a beard. He seemed to have thrown off his origins as thoroughly as the young men from Cleveland who become New Yorkers overnight.

"My family is still in Mississippi," he told me. "Nothing has changed there. They just offered my mother $13 a week to work as a cook. Mississippi hasn't been touched by what's happening in this country. That's why the South laughs at the North. There's still the company store, the company towns, and there's still that insane feeling that a black man is nothing but an overgrown boy or puppy.

"They're still a little stunned when one of their overgrown puppies takes off for the North. They talk about the men who take off for the North like they're children who have run away from a birthday party. I was one of those happy puppies that took off. When I go back home the whole place looks like a crazy zoo to me. You still can't really talk to a white man there any more than you can talk to a zebra in the Bronx Zoo."

"What about welfare? What got you on?"

"I was in Roosevelt Hospital with back trouble. When I came out my job was gone. It came to me as a shock that I was completely without money. I was completely up against the wall. It seemed wrong to me to ask for money without working for it. But I had no choice after awhile. I came down here and they looked at my clothes a little suspiciously—too suspiciously, I thought—but anyway they gave me money to live on, which I needed."

"What do you think of welfare now?"

"There has to be welfare. What's going to happen to people when they need money and they have no way of getting any? Do you know why I'm here now? I'm working now. I got a job as a trainee salesmen. I get $75 a week. But I don't get my first check until next Friday. My rent is due tonight in a place where you're out if you don't have it. I don't have a brother or sister, or aunt or uncle or friend who can loan me the money I need to live on until next Friday. Right now, they're discussing upstairs whether to give me the money."

"What will you do if they don't give you an emergency check?"

"What would you do?" he asked me.

THE CITY GROWS MORE RESPONSIVE

Quite aside from in-migration, the welfare population in New York has been rising because of a change in policy under the Lindsay Administration. For years, the right to public assistance was kept carefully unpublicized in New York, as elsewhere. There has always been the fear that the welfare population would soar if all the poor who were eligible for welfare should apply. Welfare officials accepted this code of silence, except for some Southern officials who passed out handbills urging the poor to migrate to New York. Every study of public welfare has criticized the secrecy of welfare bureaucracies. It was not until former Welfare Commissioner Mitchell I. Ginsberg, now Administrator of the Human Resources Administration, took over the department in 1966 that the paralyzing fear of public attention was brought to an end. Mr. Ginsberg revealed the magnitude of poverty in New York City. He made welfare a serious topic for national discussion.

The new attitude is reflected in the rise in the rate of acceptance of applications. The A.D.C. rate of acceptance rose from 66.5 per cent in 1965 to 81.4 per cent in 1968. The Home Relief acceptance rate went from 52.9 per cent in 1965 to 74.2 per cent in 1968.

As a result, thousands of New Yorkers who would otherwise be surviving—or not surviving—by who knows what means have been brought under the welfare umbrella. I talked to a 56-year-old Negro woman, a domestic, who came to New York 20 years ago. She told me she would never have needed welfare if her varicose veins had held out. But she had to go into the hospital and, when she came out, she needed money for rent, and her landlord had an eviction notice for her.

On 103d Street, I saw a 19-year-old girl who didn't know she was pregnant until she went to a clinic for stomach pains. She had to give up her job and go on Home Relief.

On West 85th Street, I talked to a woman who came to New York from Virginia 20 years ago. She was working in a dress factory on West 37th Street when her 15-year-old son came from Virginia to live with her. She had to give up her job when she found out that he was a heavy drinker, stealing money from her to buy liquor. She needed welfare so that she could stay home to watch him. She said she had to do what she could to save her son's life.

At the St. Nicholas Center, I spoke to a 20-year-old girl who left home when she was 15. She had supported herself for five years by hustling, and now she was pregnant and unable to continue her business.

A 19-year-old girl wrote on her welfare application: "I have no one to help me. I was living with my grandmother, but she put me out on the street with my two children."

A 17-year-old girl told me: "My baby's milk bill is $7 every two weeks. I have to pay my baby sitter $30 every two weeks so that I can stay in high school and graduate. My full check is only $76 every two weeks. I need more money for my baby sitter or else I can't finish school." "What about the baby's father?" I asked her. "Him? I don't want to be bothered with him. Why should he see the baby? It's my baby. He did nothing for the baby."

A white man wearing the clothes of a longshoreman, but unable to do a longshoreman's work, told me: "I had to go on relief in August when I came out of the hospital. I didn't want to go back to the Bowery. I've lived there. I don't want to live that way again. This way, with welfare I know where my check is coming from. I know just what I've got.

"But I also know I can't do what a working guy can do. I buy Bugler and Tops for smoking. I live like a loner. On welfare, you've go to live alone. If you go overboard and spend $4 or $5 on beer, you have to lock yourself in your room until your next check comes. You can't buy a friend a beer at a bar. I read old newspapers and paperback books that I find."

In the office of a director of a welfare center, I heard a discussion about a $25,000-a-year public-relations man who lost his job, couldn't find another and had to apply for welfare to keep from starving.

On West 109th Street, I talked to a Puerto Rican mother who had to quit her job, after nine years, so that she could take care of her daughter's baby—so that her daughter could return to school. Her daughter was in the eighth grade.

A drug addict at the East End Center told me: "It's better for me to get welfare than to go out and steal. Do you see those eight guys against the wall? They're all addicts." At the St. Nicholas Center, I watched an addict haggle with an investigator for $1.20 carfare. Another addict, sitting next to me, said: "That means he won't have to steal some poor bastard's clothes."

ACTIVISTS EDUCATE THE POOR

Closely related to the city's new attitude is a campaign being waged by activists to educate the poor in their welfare rights. The pioneers in this movement are Richard A. Cloward and Frances Fox Piven, authors of "A Strategy to End Poverty," which, after being privately circulated, was published in The Nation in May, 1966. They had observed that most of the people applying for help at Mobilization for Youth offices and the like were welfare clients complaining about the treatment they received at welfare centers. In addition, they estimated, on the basis of census studies, that for every person receiving welfare there was at least another in the community who was also eligible for welfare but did not apply because of shame or lack of information. They urged the poor to express themselves by getting on welfare and fighting for their legitimate legislative rights by exerting the pressure of their numbers on public officials. In the long run, they hoped, the rising case load would bring a crisis in the welfare system and force the nation to adopt some such alternative as the negative income tax or guaranteed annual income.

Today, some 200 storefront centers are being operated by welfare groups in New York City. A typical one is the United Welfare League in a storefront at 105th Street and Columbus Avenue. Its rent and personnel are paid for by funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity. Its field director is Mrs. Sydelle Moore, who went from being on welfare to her present job. She has more than 3,500 cases in her files.

"How did you add to the welfare population in the city?" I asked Mrs. Moore, who speaks quietly but with the power of experience. Her tone is that of an assistant professor and she probably knows more about welfare than most of the sociology professors in America.

"We can't take credit for all of the increase," she said.

"But we did bring welfare clients together for the first time, and that brought other

people out too. We made them look at one another. We got them to talk about their troubles. We brought them out of their dirty rooms, their isolation. They were mostly ashamed, frightened, isolated. They took it for granted that the rats, the stopped toilets, the broken plaster, the hotwater pipes that only gave cold water, the steam pipes that never worked were their punishment for being on welfare.

"Then we began to find a lot of people who needed welfare but who were ashamed to go to the welfare offices. They would rather starve than ask for financial assistance. We began what we call our 'outreach program.'

"We think of our territory as covering most of the Upper West Side from Central Park West to Riverside Drive from about 125th Street down to the West 80's. This is a big part of the welfare world of New York. We go through the buildings on the West Side, knocking on the doors, talking to the people in their rooms, finding out if they need help. We've located a lot of people who needed welfare but who wouldn't have been found dead in a welfare center. We tell them about the Social Welfare Law. We let them know what their legitimate rights are, and we help them get through the intake process, which is often the most humiliating, though it doesn't have to be."

"How many people did you add to the welfare population in August?" I asked Mrs. Moore.

"We'd have to check our files. We found a lady on Central Park West who was behind in her rent. A lady and her son on West 107th Street. We find a lot of people who need welfare, who don't even know about supplementation. We're finding that people aren't afraid of welfare now. Not just us but all the poverty programs are making welfare more open. The VISTA workers are bringing people into welfare.

"But in the beginning the people on welfare were ashamed to come to our meetings. The poor don't trust one another. That's why the welfare workers have been able to get away with doing nothing for the poor. But now the poor have learned that they can demand their legitimate rights. This is what the welfare revolution is all about, the poor for the first time are demanding their legitimate rights and the public is angry at the poor for speaking up, when for years the public has said the poor are too apathetic and lazy to care about themselves."

"What are legitimate rights?" I asked Mrs. Moore.

"The right to your full budget allowance. The right to proper clothing. The right to job training. The right to proper day-care centers. The right to demand an increase in the budget allowances. Our studies show that the total costs for a year of a welfare family of four persons living on the Upper West Side of Manhattan are $7,199.47. And all that a A.D.C. family of four gets today is about $4,000 a year. The children on welfare do not get money for movies, toys, games, books."

"About 45 per cent of all the people who work in New York City don't earn as much as $7,199 a year," I told Mrs. Moore.

She said, "The welfare families need money to stay alive, to give them what they can't get by working. The people who work have something that money can't buy, no matter how little they earn. And if your figures are official, welfare may then become the biggest *employer* of persons in New York City."

During recent months, 500 to 1,000 West Side neighborhood people have crowded the offices of the United Welfare League each week seeking information about welfare or asking the League to intervene for them in problems they had with welfare. One was Mrs. Tonice Weston—her husband had died—his $15,000-a-year income suddenly cut off. She was five months pregnant, she had an eviction notice, and the welfare investigator was insisting that she vacate her six-room apartment on the West Side that rented for $138.50 a month.

"I never dreamt I would ever need welfare," Mrs. Weston told me. "I never knew there was an organization like the United Welfare League that could step in for people. I never dreamt a government employee would be sitting in my living room, telling me that I had to move. Move where? Where can you get six decent rooms in New York City today for $138.50?

"Welfare makes people ignorant. They confuse you. They make you feel like you're stumbling around in the dark. I'm an actress. I'm used to taking direction. I can understand explanations. But I was as confused as hell about what was happening to me. Can you imagine the experience of people with less education and experience than I've had? You don't get reasonable explanations of what welfare is all about when you go into the office. When a caseworker talks to you there's no explanation of a lot of things; it's as though they're not talking to people but to objects. I know it's a heartbreaking job if you try to see every person as a human being, but that's the job."

"To do what?" I asked.

"The investigators shouldn't play guessing games with you. They should level with you about your rights and what you're entitled to. I was left really broke. But I had to find out through gossip that I was entitled to a layette, a crib and a lot of other things I'll need for my baby. It's eerie when you speak to an investigator. They don't hear what you say. They probably have a built-in recorder that speaks for them and that turns people off. It must make the job easier if they act on the assumption that all the people they're talking to are ignorant. When the investigator came into my living room he was surprised to see a wall of books and he kept talking about it as though it was the strangest sight he had ever seen in his life. A black woman with a wall of books.

"There's another funny thing about welfare. I only applied during the summer but I feel like I've been on welfare all of my life. I think it's because nobody sees a future for you. I'd like to see the welfare centers a place of hope, where people get excited about the changes that are going to take place in their lives and not sit the way I see them do, like they've been dead for 10 years. Welfare should be the starting place for people, not the end.

"I used to hear about the 15-year-old girls who were pregnant and who were second- and third-generation welfare mothers. I've seen them now in the flesh. They're sick kids. They have the look of doom about them. Who helps them? I wouldn't stay on welfare a minute after I get my Social Security check, my baby is born and I can find someone to look after it so that I can get to work."

The most tragic group among welfare recipients is the children. There are 600,000 welfare children in New York, and 445,300 of them are fatherless.

The basic rule in New York is that a man can be in the home but he must contribute whatever income he has toward the support of his family. This applies to married and unmarried men. Nobody knows how many men "abandon" their families so the families can receive welfare payments to "supplement" low-paying jobs. Nor does anybody know how many men desert their families because they are afraid of fatherhood.

But the results are clear. The children, whatever their age, become adults before they ever have a childhood. They leap from infancy into a fatherless world. They suffer a grade retardation twice as great as nonwelfare school children. As many as 60 per cent of the referrals to mental retardation institutions come from welfare families. In more than 85 out of 100 cases the retardation results from environmental deprivation rather than organic brain damage. These children, except for the few who live in families where there is a link to stability, are exposed to a world that no child can survive without damage. They see adults as enemies. They understand perfectly their status as welfare children but they are helpless to change what they understand. How can any child be expected to stand up against the American way of seeing welfare recipients as the living dead?

In a welfare center in Harlem I talked to a father who had deserted his children. I asked him why he never went once to look at the face of the child he had fathered. He told me he had never seen the face of his own father. "So what?" I said. He said "What good is it seeing the face of my boy if I can't support him?"

"Did your father ever support you?" I asked. "No," he said. "Then you're just repeating history; you're not changing history," I said. He said, "What the hell do I care about history? Whatever I do my boy has a long hard way to go."

"They're going to ask you now to sign a paper saying that you're the father of your boy. Are you going to sign it?" "It won't make me his father." "What will make you his father?" He was silent. He gripped the table as if he might tear it to pieces. He didn't answer my question. He didn't know how to answer it.

Where is welfare heading? In a welfare center on Eighth Avenue I sat down next to a Negro man in his late 30's. His name was Mr. Mitchell. He wore a leather jacket. His slacks were neat. He had a strong quiet face. His eyes studied the room. They had focus; they did not stare inward, which is what you usually see in a welfare center—row after row of people unable to see the world around them or to feel they have a place in it.

I said, "I'd like to talk to you about welfare. What it does for you. What it doesn't do. What kind of hang-ups welfare has for you. Is that all right with you?"

He looked at me for an instant to see if I was out of focus and then he said, "Sure."

"What do you think of welfare?" I asked.

"It's like being in bondage," he said, as though he had spent a lifetime thinking about it. "You can survive, but that's about all. I feel they should abolish welfare. The kids grow up on welfare with the attitude that everything should be free and easy. With parents that work, the kids are different, they look different, they think different, they see things ahead of them, they're moving toward something real in this world. The kids I see on welfare in the neighborhood around the West 140's are looking for a handout. It's killing them. I see kids of 10 and 11 and 12 on dope. They have babies when they're 12 and 13. They're pulling down whatever the rest of the black people are pulling up. These kids need leadership. They need it bad."

"How would you give it to them?"

"Nobody ever asked me that before," he said. "But welfare should let a man in the house. Forget the rules, if he's the kind of man you see around the blocks in Harlem he can't make enough money to take care of a family. But he makes some money. He can't take on the responsibility for a whole family. Some men can't face that kind of responsibility. It drives them away. But let them face whatever responsibility they can take and they might stay on."

"Would it drive you away?"

"No, it wouldn't," he said. "I don't have any children yet but one is on its way. It won't set me running. I wouldn't leave my kids. I take that seriously, having kids."

"What about the men you talk to, what kind of reasons do they give for leaving their children?"

"They say they don't make enough money. They say they don't have enough money for themselves if they have to give to the family. They never grew up in families where they

saw a father giving money to the family. They don't know what it means to support a child. They never saw it done. They grew up without support. You can tell the guys who never saw their fathers. Something is cut of of them, like they don't belong to anyone, like everyone is an enemy. They produce babies but they never had any training to be a father. They never saw it done, being a father. They never come around to see their babies, most of them. You got a lot of guys that need to be made into fathers."

"Why are you here today, sitting in a welfare office?" I asked. "You look like you can make out."

"I can. I got on welfare in August because the place where I was working on 38th Street closed down. Then I had to go into Harlem Hospital for two weeks. When I came out I needed money to pay the rent that was due on my apartment. You don't get a chance to save for emergencies on $84 a week. But now I found a job with the Board of Education. I'll be starting work next Monday."

"Then why are you here today?"

"Just to ask them for some money to buy working clothes. I need some winter clothes for this new job."

"Will the job pay you much money?"

"It'll pay me less than what they say a poverty wage is here in New York City. I'll get $2,800 a year for a six-hour day. That's less than poverty. But I need a job. And I got it. After that stay in hospital I can't take the kind of jobs I used to be able to handle."

"When did you come to New York City?"

"In September, 1957."

"Do you remember how you came, why you came, what made you give up your home in the South?"

"That's something you don't forget," he said. "I was doing construction work in Columbia, S.C. I was making $1.50 an hour. I thought I could make more money in that same trade in New York. Some of my family was living here. I had some cousins, aunts, an uncle. I had a long talk with my mother about going. She said it was my decision. The South was getting worse. The court decisions made the whites begin to go by the rules, and they made all the rules go against you.

"I got on a bus and came to New York. I thought I could go right into construction work. I learned I had to get into a union first. No union would take me. I got a job in a restaurant I didn't want to do. I kept getting jobs I didn't want to do. There was no job I wanted to stick to because I knew that construction was my real job.

"That happens to a lot of guys from the South here in New York. They come knowing what they want, but nobody in this city wants to know it. That sets you drifting. You keep drifting. One day you find out that the only thing out there for you is welfare. Without welfare you have to kill or steal just to keep alive. I never thought I would end up needing welfare."

"Now that you're on welfare, what would you like it to be like for you?" I asked.

"Welfare should be quick, swift. They should have people working here who can immediately size up a person, then know what to do for them, real quick, to get them off and going again. There should be no more suspicion about money, thinking people are cheating. The important thing is to get people moving. But these people who work here are all blind. They don't look at you. They don't know you or want to know you. They want to keep things moving for themselves, not for you. They're supposed to be here working for you, not for themselves."

There would be nothing really wrong with the present system of public assistance if America would forget its punitive, deep-rooted, almost hysterical hatred of poor people who speak up before they are spoken to. The legal structure guiding welfare is not inhuman. The intake interview does not have to be dehumanizing. The welfare caseworker does not have to be faceless. The energy it now takes to destroy welfare children could be used to help the children get through the bleak days of dependency.

Somehow or other, America has to forget its puffed-up image as a righteous, pious, inviolate moral force protecting the aged, the sick and dependent children. The image simply does not square with the facts. The welfare poor are now forcing this confrontation. For the first time in America the poor are throwing off the mask of meekness imposed on them by organized systems of welfare and charity. The Communists could not arouse the American poor. The radicals never did. But now the American poor have surfaced, whatever the historical reasons, and it is unlikely they will permit themselves to be drowned again by the milk of human kindness.

As President, Mr. Nixon will have to face a problem almost as great as that which confronted Mr. Lincoln, the emancipation of the American poor.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT HAS TRIPLED ITS BUTTER USE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am very pleased to report that the Department of Defense has more than tripled its use of butter in military rations over the past year.

It was more than a year ago when we in the Senate representing dairy States persuaded Defense Secretary McNamara to drop the Department's ban on butter and use butter instead of margarine for all servicemen.

This ban on butter, which was established in the spring of 1966, was lifted in December 1967, when the Department began using surplus butter made available by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Since last June, the Defense Department has acquired more than 28 million pounds of butter while purchasing less than a million pounds of margarine.

During the comparative period in 1967, more than 16 million pounds of margarine was used and only around 8 million pounds of butter, which was earmarked only for the Navy and Marine Corps, who must be served butter by law.

With the military's use of butter more than tripling in less than a year a substantial burden has been taken off the domestic butter market. I hope that the Nixon administration will continue this policy and move ahead toward the total use of butter by the Armed Forces.

THE SUPREME COURT AND ITS OPPONENTS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, we live in a time when young people are more actively concerned about public affairs than ever before. Our schools are improving, the competition for higher education is more intense every year, the mass media constantly present news and opinion on public issues—with the result that more people of all ages are better informed than has ever before been true.

Within the last few years, more and more young people have become participants in grassroots efforts to influence public policy on matters such as civil rights, draft reform, and the war in Vietnam. There is increasing support every day for a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age, in recognition of the readiness of young people to assume the full responsibilities of citizenship.

As an example of this precocious concern and sense of responsibility, I would like to share with my colleagues an editorial which I have received by mail from a 15-year-old constituent of mine by the name of Joseph Kozak. Joseph Kozak holds firm opinions about some recent highly controversial decisions of the Supreme Court. His underlying concern—which I think is shared by all thoughtful Americans—is that society should "make it hard to get a conviction so that no innocent people are jailed, but not so hard that justice cannot be done."

I ask unanimous consent that Joseph Kozak's letter to me and his editorial be reprinted in the RECORD.

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

BALTIMORE, MD.

Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Senator Tydings, I am a boy of 15 years old and I have some opinions to express about the Supreme Court decisions of recent years and the attacks that have been levied against the court for the decisions. I know an opinion of a 15 year old might not mean much to you or any other members of Congress, but, please try to read my opinion like somebody important wrote them. On the other pages my opinions are expressed like an editorial. If you think that my opinions are valid or if you think my opinions are not valid please write me and tell me at least what you think. If possible, could you please show the composition to other members of the Senate and get their opinions. Can it be printed in the Congressional Record if it is good enough?

Sincerely Yours,

JOSEPH D. KOZAK.

THE SUPREME COURT AND ITS OPPONENTS

In recent years the Supreme Court has come under much attack from many people, from all walks of life concerning the decisions of the Court in cases involving the rights of the accused. Many people criticize the Court without studying the facts. People hear that a kidnaper or a murderer was set free by a decision of the Court. Such as in the Miranda Case of 1964 in which the kidnaper-rapist conviction had been overturned by the Court. In this decision the Court ruled that an accused person must be warned of certain rights before he may be questioned by the police. Such as the right to an attorney and the right to remain silent. Many people said that this made it hard to interrogate the person who was accused. They said that the hands of the police were handcuffed. Well, the facts must be examined. Miranda was identified by a girl as the one who had raped her. The police pushed him into confession almost. He had no attorney. He was convicted and sentenced to life. A quick process. In the fifth amendment it said, "No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime unless under the presentment or indictment of a grand jury. It is plain what it says and in other parts of

the Constitution (Bills of Rights) it says an accused person shall have the right to legal counsel, etc. The Court was faced with a difficult problem. How to enforce these rights? The rights were always there but there was never a way to enforce them. So, when it came up the Court had to find a way and they did a very effective way. The police thought they were handcuffed. But the police just had to adjust to a new cycle. The Court just backed up the Bill of Rights. The Court just did its job. If people think the decision is bad the fault lies in the Bill of Rights. Amend the Constitution is the best way to solve the so-called problem not blaming the Court. In other decisions, the Court ruled that a client, if he wishes, must have a lawyer present at questioning, etc., to safeguard his rights another way to enforce his rights of the accused. Another decision which I think should be noted is the Mallory decision which said that in Federal cases a person must be arraigned immediately after he is arrested. Well, the purpose is simple. To safeguard the right that a person must be informed of the charge against him and also to prevent police from questioning a person for a long period of time. In other cases involving confessions that are coerced may not be used in court. Well, in many cases police have used the third-degree and also the police drilled people for over hundreds of hours till they confessed. This is ridiculous to question people for so long. They are bound to confess even if they didn't commit the crime. You can see that police always want people to confess. It makes their job a lot easier and saves a lot of time and in most cases justice has not been dealt out.

I think that I have covered the most controversial decisions of the Supreme Court. There are more of course, but, I think the general idea I am trying to put across has been made clear. I think we should strive hard to make it hard to get a conviction so that no innocent people are jailed, but, not so hard that justice cannot be done. The line must be drawn somewhere, of course. Maybe the Court will swing the other way, sooner or later, who can tell? But if there is no Supreme Court to guard your rights, there will be no democracy and Hitler may come back in another way.

JOSEPH KOZAK.

HERCULES EFFORT CAN AID UTAH ECONOMY

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, one of Utah's great problems stems from the extent to which its economy depends upon defense expenditures. Unfortunately, this heavy reliance on defense contracts creates a sort of "boom and bust" situation, with violent swings between expansions and retrenchment. Such fluctuations create uncertainty for the thousands of Utahans who depend on these contracts for their livelihood.

The Bacchus works of Hercules, Inc., is making a concerted effort to deal with this problem. Bacchus, located at Magna, Utah, plays an important part in America's aerospace industry. Now, it inaugurates a welcome program marketing its expertise to other parts of the Government and to private industry.

Hercules' decisions to diversify into these less volatile areas is certainly welcome. I have been deeply concerned to see the Hercules payroll slip from its high of more than 6,000 in 1963. I am sure that the same outstanding performance which Hercules exhibits in its missile-motor production will be seen in its new undertakings. That list of undertakings is indeed impressive. Services which Hercules offers both government and private industry include engineering, manufacturing, quality assurance, testing, and analysis, computer services, graphic services, communication consultation, safety management, and industrial engineering.

Hercules' effort comes on the heels of the transition being made by Sperry-Utah from its main reliance on the Sergeant missile to a much more broadly based, and consequently less economically volatile, computer manufacture operation. Of course, we appreciate the defense contracts which go to Utah firms. However, it is especially gratifying to see a major contractor not entirely dependent upon the Department of Defense for its work.

Mr. President, I join other Utahans in expressing my support and hopes for Hercules' success in this new, and most important venture.

JACOB BLAUSTEIN: A MOST UNUSUAL OIL MAN

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, Forbes magazine of last September 15 devoted its cover article to Mr. Jacob Blaustein, one of the leading citizens of the State of Maryland, a person of quiet prominence in the business world, in cultural and philanthropic affairs, and in the Nation's service. Mr. Blaustein has lived in Baltimore for all of his 75 years.

His father, Louis, came to this country from Lithuania, settled in Baltimore and launched himself in the oil business. In competition with the giants of that industry he founded the American Oil Co. Under his imaginative management that company flourished, eventually merged with the Pan American Petroleum and Transport Co. and, after a lengthy legal struggle, with Standard Oil of Indiana. By that last merger, Jacob Blaustein became a member of the board of Indiana Standard and his family, the largest single stockholder.

Now, through family-held corporations, he is the owner of innumerable real estate and business enterprises throughout the country, he has a controlling interest in the Union Trust Co. of Maryland and is the major stockholder of the United States Fidelity and Guarantee Co. But not only is he a major power in the business world; Jacob Blaustein is one of the Nation's most interesting and public-spirited business leaders.

Because he is a person who shuns publicity, his innumerable services to the United States, the United Nations, and the cause of world peace and justice are not widely known. For that reason, I would like to share with my colleagues the article from Forbes Magazine, and request unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JACOB BLAUSTEIN? WHO'S HE?

Just a giant figure in the oil industry. Just a prominent part-time diplomat who has made history. A multimillionaire. Yet a man who has always attempted to avoid the business spotlight.

He helped talk Vyacheslav Molotov and the other delegates at the United Nations conference in San Francisco in 1945 into accepting the human rights provisions of the UN Charter, and later he played a major part in convincing David Ben-Gurion to accept the UN plan to partition Palestine. Still later he negotiated with Chancellor Konrad Adenauer the deal under which West Germany agreed to pay the surviving victims of Adolf Hitler's crimes a total of $10 billion in reparations.

Day in, day out for months he fought the Russians at the UN. One of the demands of the Soviet Union was the forced repatriation of all Russians and other Eastern Europeans left on this side of the Iron Curtain when World War II ended. He opposed the demand because he knew that "if they had gotten those people back, the probability is they would have liquidated them." He also debated the Russians on Korea, demanding a UN-supervised election to unite the country. These were bitter debates, but soon after, he says, "a curious thing happened: I ran into my two Russian opponents, Arkady Sobolev and Jacob Malik, in the lounge of the United Nations. They put their arms around me and Jacob Malik said, 'Your government is no good but you're all right. Let's have a drink.' "

This is not the portrait of a professional diplomat. It's the portrait of Jacob Blaustein, a man born into the oil business, who, at 75, has spent his entire life in the oil business. A director of Standard Oil Co. (Ind.), he and his family and their various enterprises and trusts, according to a recent proxy statement, own approximately 2.7 million shares of the company's stock (3.6%) worth, at current prices, more than $142 million. They are the company's largest stockholder. In addition, through family-held corporations, American Trading & Production Corp. and Blaustein Industries, they own and operate a fleet of tankers; oil wells in Texas and Louisiana; several manufacturing companies; have vast real-estate holdings in Baltimore, Dallas, San Diego and Los Angeles; are the controlling stockholders in Maryland's second- or third-largest bank, the Union Trust Co.; and major stockholders in the United States Fidelity & Guarantee Co.

Blaustein's family wealth was made by him and his father, not inherited. Altogether the Blaustein fortune has been estimated at between $150 million and $200 million, enough to place it among the largest in America today.

Jacob Blaustein is a most unusual oil man. He defies all the stereotypes. He's not a Texan; he comes from Baltimore and has lived there all his life. He's not big, burly and boistrous, but slender and soft-spoken. He dresses as quietly as a bank president, drinks sparingly, raises orchids, collects paintings—Gauguin, Derain, Utrillo—enjoys listening to classical music and used to play the piano. A graduate of Lehigh University—at the ripe age of 18—he also holds eight honorary doctorates including one from Lehigh, and many other awards.

For all his mild manner, he's just as tough as any of his fellow oil tycoons. It's not only the Russians who have discovered this; the oil industry, including the old, departed management of Standard of Indiana, has, too.

FATHER STARTED IT

The story of Jacob Blaustein really begins with his father, Louis Blaustein, who came to America from Lithuania while still in his early teens. Like so many immigrants of his time, he became a peddler, traveling with his wares by horse and buggy from farm to farm in eastern Pennsylvania. Later he opened a small dry-goods store in Downingtown. After several years he moved to Baltimore, where he started a wholesale grocery store.

Among other things, he sold coal oil, as kerosene was then called. The jobber delivered the coal oil in wooden barrels, which he

left on the sidewalk, and the elder Blaustein noticed that on hot days the glue holding the staves together melted, letting some of his profits leak away. He made a suggestion: Why not deliver the coal oil in a steel tank with a spigot, placed on a dray wagon? The jobber was so impressed with the idea that he offered Blaustein a job as a salesman.

Louis Blaustein had invented the oil tank-wagon.

From the jobber, Blaustein went to work for a small oil refinery in Baltimore. "Competition was rough and ruthless in those days," says Jacob Blaustein. "Standard Oil [N.J.] was out to ruin the small refiners by underselling them. For example, a 50-gallon barrel generally cost $1.50. Standard at times would think nothing of selling coal oil, barrel included for 3 cents a gallon, $1.50, just the cost of the barrel itself."

Standard wiped out Louis Blaustein's employer, and then it offered Blaustein a job. "My father worked for Jersey Standard for 18 years," says Jacob Blaustein, "and then one day in 1910 they called him in and said they wanted to send him to Germany to organize the company there. My father agreed, but my mother, Henrietta, said nothing doing. She said: 'I had enough of the old country. I'm not going back. Our children were born in America and I want them reared in America, a free country.'

"It's a lucky thing for us she put her foot down. Had we gone to Germany, we might all have been annihilated."

Blaustein soon after quit Standard and started his own company, American Oil. Despite the impressive name, it consisted merely of three men, a small tank wagon and a horse, operating from a converted stable. The men were Louis Blaustein, the precocious Jacob, who had just been graduated from Lehigh, and the driver of the wagon. They were jobbers, selling kerosene to retailers.

"My father's experience with Standard had taught him one thing: In the oil business, if you were small, you could not hope to compete with a bigger company by cutting prices. You could only compete with innovations," says Blaustein. "The bigger company always could undersell you."

The Blausteins' first innovation was the drive-in gasoline station in the U.S. It was on Cathedral Street in Baltimore. "Until we got the idea," says Jacob Blaustein, "you had to service autos at the curb. It was a clumsy operation."

"SEE WHAT YOU GET"

Next the Blausteins invented a gasoline pump that enabled a motorist to see just how much gas he was getting. Until then all pumps were "blind." The motorist knew that a certain number of turns of the crank were supposed to pour a certain number of gallons of gasoline into his car, but it was very easy for the gas attendant to make a mistake in counting. "And even with an honest gas attendant you could be cheated," says Jacob Blaustein. "The attendant might crank the handle a couple of times without any gasoline going into your car, because there wasn't enough suction yet in the pump."

What the Blausteins did was put a five-gallon calibrated water jar on top of the pump. The gasoline was first pumped into the jar and then it was poured into the car. The Blausteins promoted this device with the slogan: "See What You Get; Get What You See." It was the forerunner of today's metered pump.

Their greatest innovation—the one that really made American Oil—was antiknock gas. In the early days of the automobile, gasoline was of low octane. As the auto manufacturers improved the engines, this low-octane gas began to cause a bothersome knock because it didn't burn fast enough. The Blausteins got the idea of mixing benzol, a volatile by-product of coke, with the gasoline they were selling. They hired a chemist, and by a process of trial and error, finally hit on a mixture that would burn more readily than regular gasoline without blowing up the car. They called it Amoco and charged 5 cents more a gallon for it, promoting it with the slogan: "Feed your car Amoco-Gas and you'll think it's on a diet—it requires so little." Amoco-Gas powered Charles A. Lindbergh's *Spirit of St. Louis* on its flight across the Atlantic to Paris. Not until Jersey Standard came out with Ethyl did Amoco have a rival.

The Blausteins built American Oil into a great company, but it was a vulnerable one because it had to depend on competitors for its supplies of gasoline. They decided to make themselves independent of their competitors. That decision was to lead to a slam-bang, court battle with Standard Oil of New Jersey and Standard Oil of Indiana.

Jacob Blaustein will not discuss it now. He says: "I get along fine with the present management of Standard of Indiana. The old management is all gone—by death and otherwise. I don't want to reopen old wounds." However, the facts are a matter of record, and the record runs to thousands of pages.

What happened was this: To assure themselves of a dependable source of supply, the Blausteins, in 1923, sold a half interest in American Oil to Pan American Petroleum & Transport. Pan American was then an independent company, with large reserves of crude, refineries, tankers and terminals.

Some time later Indiana Standard started buying into Pan American. By 1929 it owned approximately 96% of the stock. In 1932, as part of a major deal, Indiana Standard ordered Pan American to sell all its foreign properties to Jersey Standard. The deal included Pan American's crude oil reserves, its tanker fleet, and its refinery at Aruba. In exchange, Indiana Standard received a large block of stock in Jersey Standard, much of which Indiana has since paid out to its own stockholders.

BOOMERANG

The Blausteins were in a box. Having started out to make themselves independent of their competitors, they now found themselves at the mercy of their biggest competitor, Jersey Standard, since Jersey Standard now owned Pan American's facilities. They asked Pan American to let American Oil build its own refinery. Indiana Standard would not permit it. Thereupon they threatened legal action to prevent the sale of Pan American's foreign properties to Jersey Standard. At that, Indiana Standard agreed to a compromise. The agreement provided for a merger of Pan American and American Oil, under which, in exchange for their remaining 50% of American Oil, the Blausteins were to get a block of stock in Pan America. Louis Blaustein became president and Jacob Blaustein executive vice president of Pan American, and chairman of the board and president, respectively, of American.

The agreement also provided for making the merged company fully integrated, meaning Pan American would not have to buy refined products from Indiana Standard or Jersey Standard but could build its own refineries and produce and buy its crude oil wherever it was advantageous to do so.

The agreement was signed on Jan. 1, 1933. But soon after, Indiana Standard announced that, because of the Depression, it didn't make economic sense for Pan American to build its own refinery. Instead, Indiana Standard ordered Pan American to buy its refined products from a subsidiary of Jersey Standard. Indiana Standard also ordered Pan American to buy its crude from a subsidiary of Indiana Standard and to use a pipeline belonging partly to a subsidiary of Indiana Standard and partly to a subsidiary of Jersey Standard. In 1937, the Blausteins, father and son, brought suit against both Indiana Standard and Jersey Standard. It was a case of David and his son taking on two Goliaths.

The suit went on for years, during which, in 1937, Louis Blaustein died. It went from court to court. The Blaustein lawyer was Henry L. Stimson, Herbert Hoover's Secretary of State. One day, while Stimson and Jacob Blaustein were discussing the case in Stimson's office, the phone rang. It was Franklin D. Roosevelt. The President told Stimson: "I'd like you to become my Secretary of War." Stimson explained that he was in the middle of a case. Blaustein interrupted: "You can't refuse a request like that." He went out and got another top lawyer, former New York Governor Nathan Miller, then chief counsel to U.S. Steel, to head the Stimson staff.

In 1954, after 17 years of litigation, the suit was finally settled by a deal under which Pan American and American Oil were merged into Indiana Standard with the Blaustein family receiving Standard stock and Jacob Blaustein going on the board. Far from having its own enterprise finally swallowed up in the old Standard Oil complex, the Blaustein family ended up as the largest stockholder in Indiana Standard, third-largest unit of the old Rockefeller empire.

Blaustein is not the kind of stockholder who merely sits back and counts his dividends, nor is Blaustein the kind of director who merely adorns his company's letterhead. He flies out to Chicago several times a month to meet with management and the other directors, and he travels constantly inspecting company properties and discussing company business. On his business and his diplomatic missions, one day will find him in Texas, another in Alaska, a third in New York, a fourth in London or Geneva, a fifth in the Near East, a sixth in Washington. Although he lives with his wife Hilda in a three-story stone house on a 200-acre farm in a suburb of Baltimore, he maintains an apartment in New York because that has been the headquarters of American Oil and is the headquarters of the United Nations. He also maintains an apartment in Chicago, because that is the headquarters of Indiana Standard.

"OIL IS EXCITING"

He operates from a 30-story tower of aluminum and glass on the corner of Charles and Fayette Streets in Baltimore. The Blaustein Building is diagonally across the street from the Charles Center urban renewal project of the Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency but is not part of the project. Blaustein didn't want any financial help from the Government because he knew it would mean government interference. In that attitude, he does fit the stereotype of the oil man.

He fits the stereotype in one other way: He loves the oil business. He says: "It's exciting. There's no excitement in putting up a building, but when you sink $1.5 million into a well not knowing whether it's going to come in and pay off—that's exciting."

Despite his multitude of business enterprises, Blaustein has always been active in voluntary organizations—Jewish and non-Jewish—in philanthropy, in government—under five presidents—and in politics. He was president of the American Jewish Committee for the maximum term of five years and still is honorary president. During World War II, he was acting chairman of the marketing committee of the U.S. Petroleum Administration. Right now, he's a member of the President's Commission on Marine Science, Engineering & Resources, a job he finds intriguing because, he says: "The oceans comprise five-sevenths of the earth's surface and at the bottom of the seas are to be found untold quantities of minerals [hard and petroleum] while in the seas are living resources, food and protein [to help feed the many undernourished people of the world]. The function

of our commission, simply stated, has four broad objectives: 1) how to develop the marine food and mineral resources; 2) how to utilize the marine resources to enhance U.S. prosperity and benefit all mankind; 3) how to devise means of international cooperation so nations will not grab and fight over these great resources; and 4) to recommend a plan of federal governmental organization best adapted to support the program—instead of the large number of federal agencies now handling various aspects of it. This is not an easy task, but it's a most important and fascinating one."

His career in diplomacy began in 1945 when President Franklin D. Roosevelt summoned him and former Judge Joseph M. Proskauer, then a prominent New York attorney, to Washington. The formative meetings of the United Nations were about to begin in San Francisco. The President gave Blaustein and Proskauer the job of getting provisions on human rights included in the UN Charter.

Not unexpectedly, they found opposition, Molotov was dead-set against the idea. Blaustein recalls the arguments: "No one was ever sure whether Molotov understood English," he says. "He would look at us as we spoke, his face a complete deadpan, and when we stopped speaking he would say, without the slightest change of expression, 'Nokay.' No one really knew whether he meant yes or no. It was usually no."

In the meantime, Roosevelt died, and it was to Harry S Truman that Blaustein and Proskauer made their report. Blaustein was not immediately impressed by Truman but, he says, "I never saw a man grow so quickly. He became a great President—in my opinion, one of the very greatest." In 1948, when Truman was debating with himself whether to run, he called in six people for advice. Blaustein was one.

Although Blaustein is a Democrat (he worked to make Hubert H. Humphrey the Democratic candidate for President), in 1955 Dwight D. Eisenhower appointed him a member of the U.S. delegation to the UN, where he spent much of his time debating cold-war issues with the Russians. Of this experience, he says: "With the Russians you have to make sure you're right and then stick to your guns no matter what. If you deal from strength, you may or may not win your point, but at least they will respect you. If you evidence weakness, you gain neither."

DIPLOMATIC BRIDGE

Although active in Jewish affairs, Blaustein is neither a Zionist nor an anti-Zionist, but a non-Zionist, and this has served both the U.S. and Israel in good stead. "The Israelis consider me a friend," he says, "but I can also sit down and talk with the Arabs because they know I'm not a Zionist." One of the most delicate tasks Blaustein had was to convince David Ben-Gurion to issue a statement accepting the fact that American Jews had no allegiance except to America. Until then, the Israelis had the idea that Jews everywhere in the world should consider Israel their true homeland. This outraged many American Jews and it embarrassed the State Department. Blaustein flew to Israel and sat down with Ben-Gurion and, after 16 hours of negotiating, made him understand the position of American Jews. The two men have remained fast friends ever since and correspond regularly.

Blaustein not only was one of the two men who negotiated the agreement under which West Germany has been paying reparations to victims of Hitlerism, it was actually his idea. Early in 1951, John J. McCloy, then U.S. High Commissioner to West Germany, got in touch with him to ask his views on the direction the country should take to win its way back into the family of nations. In a series of conferences in Washington, Blaustein said nothing could ever atone for the Nazi crimes, but he did outline to McCloy a plan for West Germany to provide relief, rehabilitation and resettlement for victims of Nazi persecution—non-Jews as well as Jews. Out of this came not only West Germany's agreement to pay reparations to Hitler's surviving victims, but also agreements by Krupp, I.G. Farben and several other West German companies to indemnify slave laborers.

Blaustein manages to combine his business activities and his other activities because he normally works a 16-hour day. He sleeps only about four or five hours a night. He doesn't waste a minute. On his flights to Chicago to attend the board meetings of Indiana Standard, he works all the way, and when he lands at the airport, "a company chauffeur meets me with an envelope full of the additional items we are to take up at the meeting the next day. I review them that night."

At home, he works after dinner until 2 a.m. or 3 a.m. in the morning on business and public affairs matters, awakens at 6:45 to get to his office in the Blaustein Building before 8:30. He says: "I have been doing this for a long time and it suits my constitution to work this way. I sleep soundly until the alarm rings and feel no fatigue."

He has no intention of retiring because he believes that "work refreshes me." his appearance bears that out. Although he's 75, he doesn't look it. In fact, he says he's seeking new business activities to get into. Why? "I believe in diversification," Blaustein says, "but, even more important, new things are interesting."

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE ANNIVERSARY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today many Americans and thousands of Ukrainians who live outside the Ukraine in the free world, observe the 51st anniversary of Ukrainian independence. It is a sad commentary that no one inside the Ukraine can celebrate openly because the heel of Soviet repression is firmly planted on the government and people of that once-proud nation.

Indeed, if anyone had hopes that the yoke of tyranny would soon be lifted from the Ukraine and from the other Soviet satellites, the brutal and all-too-characteristic invasion of Czechoslovakia last summer dashed that hope. I was in the Soviet Union at the time, and made my strong protest heard through the American Embassy in Moscow. It is but a short step from Czechoslovakia to the Ukraine in geography; it is no step at all in terms of the tragic fate they share.

Self-determination is the capstone of any nation's development. To have achieved it and lost it, as the Ukraine did, is cause for deep grief. Today, we celebrate the achievement of Ukrainian independence, mourn its loss, and reaffirm our hope and confidence that it will one day be regained.

EASTERN AIRLINES SAYS FLIGHTS PROVE STOL AIRCRAFT ARE FEASIBLE AND BELIEVED ANSWER TO CONGESTION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the crisis of the airports and of the airways is a complex, harassing, dangerous, and very expensive condition.

I have been reading for several days the various statements of policy and proposals by segments of aviation for solving—or at least ameliorating—the airports/airways problem. The opinions and recommendations of the several groups representing the scheduled airlines, the owners and operators of business—executive—aircraft, the aircraft owners and pilots, and the airport executives and operators are parallel in so few instances that they constitute discouragement and create frustration for those of us wishing to be helpful in the devising of legislative remedies. It is my intent to discuss these causes of frustration and discouragement—but at a future date.

Today, I am elated by one ray of hope for a potential major breakthrough—not a claimed total solution, but a development capable of generating a very real impact for good on congested airways and overcrowded airport landing areas. I refer to the report made yesterday by an Eastern Airlines executive to the Aero Club of Washington on a protracted experiment—which he termed an unqualified success. It was a report on the flying of short-take-off-and-landing aircraft equipped with modern navigation gear. Those tests in the supersaturated northeastern air traffic corridor, mainly over Eastern's shuttle route between Washington and New York, proved to the company's officials, according to vice president A. Scott Crossfield, that the STOL can relieve congested airways and increase airline revenues. He reported that his firm believes this potentiality is so real, in fact, that its engineers are already drawing up specifications for a STOL plane to be built for scheduled carrier service over segments of Eastern's franchise routes.

We have read much, and I have discussed on previous occasions in this forum, the fact that Eastern Airlines and the McDonnell-Douglas aircraft manfacturing organization used their version of the French-designed Bruguet 941 STOL plane in the experiments. It is a 64-passenger craft that made more than 350 landings and takeoffs at Washington, New York, and Boston airports during the 7-week trial period. Takeoff required only approximately 500 feet of runway—and landings very little more, according to Mr. Crossfield's report.

Impressive were these additional important facts reported by the Eastern Airlines vice president:

The specifications for the new STOL which Eastern will order will include capacity for 125 passengers and flight speed of more than 250 miles an hour, to be maneuverable at speeds as low as 70 miles an hour.

Although a jet-powered DC-9 can make the trip from Washington to New York in 31 minutes of flying time, the airways have become so congested that the average trip time now is 70 minutes. Such wasted flying time cost the Eastern system up to $1 million a week last summer, Mr. Crossfield said. The experimental STOL plane used took 58 minutes to make the New York-Washington trip without wasting any flying time. The proposed new 125-passenger, 250-miles per hour or over STOL's would be expected to do even better.

If airports are properly developed to accommodate STOL aircraft on a permanent basis, and if navigational problems and landings can be worked out in

the airways system, Eastern officials believe the new plane would be capable of leading to a doubling of the landing capacity of airports by utilizing taxiways and the ends of unused runways. But, as Mr. Crossfield pointed out, STOL could not alleviate congestion if it uses the same navigational equipment as other conventional aircraft and if it is forced to use the same air corridors as the conventional craft.

According to today's Washington Post account of Mr. Crossfield's report on the experimental STOL, it had an onboard computer-controlled system which indicated to the pilot where he was on a map. And the system was claimed to be accurate within 25 feet of altitude and 100 feet of latitude. By using the new device, in addition to existing navigational aids, the Eastern plane was able to make its own corridors, avoiding congested routes and reducing flying time.

The special computer-controlled system used in the STOL experiment is manufactured by Decca in England. Mr. Crossfield reported that it also was used in a DC-9 which made 1,500 runs off the regular air corridors and was so effective that Eastern is considering installing it on all shuttle flights. He indicated that there is evidence to support a belief that eventually a navigation system like or similar to the Decca equipment could make arrival times so accurate that a pilot could reserve his landing time through the airport tower with a 30 second or better accuracy.

It is heartening to read in the Washington Post account today that the navigational system and the same STOL plane currently are being tested by American Airlines and that both American and Eastern officials have indicated that it might be possible to offer scheduled STOL service by the mid-1970's.

This could have a very real and helpful impact on the fight against air traffic and airport takeoff and landing congestion—and could influence legislative solutions for the airport/airways crisis.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, today we join with the Ukrainian people in commemoration of the proclamation of their independence. We, as Americans, cherish our own independence above all things. Many nations have fallen before the onslaught of the Soviet Union—the Ukrainians—as well as the rest of the peoples now behind the Iron Curtain—but so long as these people must remain slave rather than free, they will continue to hope, pray, and work for their national independence irrespective of the many killings, shedding of blood, and untold sacrifices which these gallant people have endured.

Mr. President, January 22, 1918, is the date celebrated by the Ukrainian's as their independence day, and I would like to join with my colleagues in saluting the gallantry, bravery, and persistence in their continued efforts, in spite of all hardship and sacrifice, to obtain the freedom and independence which we, as Americans, enjoy.

Mr. President, for a number of years I have introduced in the Senate of the United States concurrent resolutions similar to House Concurrent Resolution 416, passed by Congress. This law calls upon the President to take such action as may be necessary to bring before the United Nations for its consideration the question of the forceful incorporation of the Baltic States Republics into the Soviet Union. Once again, Mr. President, I ask that the United Nations be requested to enlarge the resolution to include the bringing before the United Nations for its consideration the question of the forceful incorporation of all nations which are now within the orbit of the Soviet Union against their free will. Many of my colleagues in both Houses have spoken on this great issue of liberating these people, but I believe we should generate these words into an effective resolution passed by the Congress of the United States. Only then will the independence days of all former free nations which are now behind the Iron Curtain be truly commemorated.

TRIBUTE TO ESTHER PETERSON, DIRECTOR, WOMEN'S BUREAU, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in 1961, among the hundreds of appointments made by President-elect John F. Kennedy was the announcement that Mrs. Esther Peterson was to be Director of the Women's Bureau in the Department of Labor.

Now, 8 years later, Mrs. Peterson has resigned. It is altogether fitting, however, that we take this occasion to highlight for the record—her record. For seldom has any woman in public life contributed so much in so many fields. In these 8 years, Mrs. Peterson has had not one but three careers.

In August 1961, Mrs. Peterson was named Assistant Secretary of Labor for Labor Standards. She also continued to head the Women's Bureau until early 1964 when a new director was appointed. Thereafter, the Women's Bureau remained one of several Labor Department bureaus under her jurisdiction.

When the President's Commission on the Status of Women was set up by President Kennedy in December 1961, with Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt as Chairman, Mrs. Peterson was named Executive Vice Chairman.

Mrs. Roosevelt died in November 1962 and it was Esther Peterson who provided the guidance and inspiration necessary to complete the Commission's unprecedented study of the position of women in our society. She helped formulate the conclusions and recommendations that made the Commission report, "American Women," one of the most influential social documents of our times. Its impact upon the attitudes and expectations of the Nation toward its womanpower created a new interest in opening to women enlarged opportunities in education, employment, and civil and political rights.

Mrs. Peterson gave continuing leadership as Executive Vice Chairman of the Interdepartmental Committee on the Status of Women, set up in 1963 to carry forward the work of the President's Commission and to encourage implementation of its recommendations.

Throughout her career Mrs. Peterson was a motivating force in the efforts of women's organizations, unions, social agencies, educators, and others, to secure for women full participation in the economic, social, and political life of the Nation. With her encouragement, commissions on the status of women were established in every State, the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico.

In serving the cause of American women, Esther Peterson's greatest concern has been that women take their place as full partners in every aspect of American life with the opportunity to make a maximum contribution to society. Her compassion for the disadvantaged and her understanding of the needs and aspirations of women workers made her an indefatigable worker for such legislation as the Equal Pay Act of 1963, improvement of minimum wage laws and liberalization of provisions for the care of children of working mothers. Her sense of justice and respect for the individual led her to accept an assignment as liaison for the President with the National Women's Committee for Civil Rights and to mobilize women volunteers for the Nation's poverty programs.

Mrs. Peterson has successfully combined homemaking and the rearing of four children with a career of public service, epitomizing in her own life what she would achieve for other women.

Eighty-four days after the President's Commission on the Status of Women report was delivered to President Kennedy, President Johnson launched Mrs. Peterson on career No. 2—that of consumer champion. Naming her the Nation's first Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, he sent her out to assure that the voice of the consumer was heard "loud, clear, and uncompromising."

Continuing her assignment as Assistant Secretary of Labor throughout this entire period, she once quipped that she divided her time "two-thirds at Labor, and two-thirds at the consumer job." With boundless energy and deep conviction, she set out to make certain that the American buyer was treated right in the marketplace.

The doctrine of caveat emptor—let the buyer beware—has been replaced with the doctrine of let the seller make full disclosure—

Said President Johnson in his first message to the Congress on consumer affairs. Mrs. Peterson spent 3 years giving meaning to this new doctrine.

One of her most publicized campaigns to bring new meaning to the concept of full disclosure was her campaign to achieve the enactment of the truth-in-packaging bill. She carried her battle for labeling legislation to practically every State in the Union, telling housewives and businessmen alike that fancy labels and smart packaging could not make up for short weights and vague statements of content. Her tireless efforts finally

paid off when Congress enacted packaging legislation in 1966. The need for other legislative reforms were well established by Mrs. Peterson—truth-in-lending, meat inspection, improved safety laws—these and many other issues that later became the laws of the land were pushed forward during the Peterson tenure. But more than any specific legislative accomplishments was the confidence she inspired among consumers throughout the country. This confidence was perhaps the most significant hallmark of Mrs. Peterson's leadership of the consumer program. At last consumers had their own friend in court. Their letters poured into her office—and every single one was given a thoughtful, personal reply. A Washington observer who followed closely the activities of Mrs. Peterson's office wrote:

> With the creation of a consumer office in the White House, the regulatory area was finally structured so that top-level policymakers could peer into the independent fiefdoms and insist on the development of a coordinated and balanced battle plan. The display of Presidential interest gave the consumer cause sufficient political glamour so that members of Congress became interested in advancing consumer legislation.

In March of 1967, Mrs. Peterson asked to be relieved of the consumer assignment—"it has come to the point where this assignment demands someone's full-time attention." She returned to the Department of Labor to undertake new responsibilities, and became the Administrator of the Department's newly created Wage and Labor Standards Administration. In this capacity, Mrs. Peterson was involved in a renewed effort to improve the working conditions of all the Nation's workers. Mrs. Peterson's boss, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz has stated:

> It could well prove, in retrospect, the Department of Labor's most enduring activity in 1968 that there was a strong emphasis placed on the protection of working people's physical safety and health.

It was Mrs. Peterson who went on a personal and official campaign to achieve passage of the administration's Occupational Safety and Health Act. The bill failed but she created a climate of opinion that will make it easier by far for her successors to achieve its passage.

And so, Mrs. Peterson's Government service comes to an end. Women, consumers, working people, no small majority of the American public, are in her debt. She has proved once again what too many of us too often forget—that a person dedicated to a belief that change can happen, and that wrongs can be righted can make a difference.

APPOINTMENT TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, as acting chairman of the Committee on Commerce, I wish to announce that I have today appointed the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN), as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

MINERAL KING RECREATIONAL AREA

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, during the 4 years I have served as U.S. Senator, I have worked very hard for the development of Mineral King as an all-year recreational area, not only for the people of California, but for the many visitors who will be attracted to this magnificent project from all parts of the world.

On January 27, the U.S. Forest Service announced approval of a master plan of the Walt Disney organization for this $35 million project in the Sequoia National Forest.

The development of this plan, and the construction of an appropriate all-weather access road, for which the first contract will be awarded next summer, is the result of close cooperation between many State and Federal agencies. It has had the support and cooperation not only of two California Governors but also that of the U.S. Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and other Federal agencies; the California Legislature and its agencies, including the California Highway Commission and the State highway engineers; officials of Tulare County, U.S. Senators, Congressmen, and many private citizens and civic groups throughout California.

Of main interest to me, Mr. President, is that this project is not only an ideal cooperative effort and association between private enterprise and Federal and State agencies, but that its many benefits to the people, the Government, and the State will come without any additional costs to the taxpayer.

Aside from the great enjoyment which will be provided for generations to come, the development of Mineral King will result in substantial economic employment opportunities for the San Joaquin Valley area and will provide new sources of tax revenues for both Tulare County and our State government.

It is estimated that the economic benefits, primarily to the San Joaquin Valley, will total $500 million during the first 10 years of the project's operation. These would take the form of new investments, including $57 million for project and road construction alone. New payrolls will include $6 million a year from the Disney organization alone; new property, sales, gasoline and State income tax revenues will total $33.8 million. Project-related employment will create 2,500 jobs by 1978.

Mr. President, one of the most important problems facing us today is to assure we make proper decisions on how to preserve or, in some way, best use our natural resources. Invariably these issues are complex, often controversial, and always require resolution based on the highest order of statesmanship, cooperation, and understanding.

It is my opinion that the numerous government and private organizations I have mentioned, who were ultimately responsible for the final decision in this matter, deserve the highest marks for the dedication, responsibility, and foresight they have exhibited in bringing this vast project to fruition.

APPOINTMENT TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, as acting chairman of the Committee on Commerce, I wish to announce that I have today appointed the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY) as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

BARBARIC BEHAVIOR IN IRAQ

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I was truly shocked to see the act perpetrated by the regime in Iraq just the other day. To take a group of citizens out and hang them after a drumhead trial which was a mockery of justice was bad enough. To do so because of their religious faith is still another.

It seems that the regime there has abdicated all reason and responsibility. They make war upon the Israelis. Their bloodcurdling threats against the Jewish state fill the airwaves. When their overt acts of aggression come to naught, they turn inward against the easiest target that presents itself—Iraq's surviving Jewish community.

It is obvious that most of those executed were guilty of merely espousing a given religious faith. They were helpless and convenient targets for the wrath of a group of frightened, hateful people.

Is there no end to the barbaric behavior of these people? It seems there is not. To make matters worse, this regime has seized the persons of several American citizens, thrusting them into prison. This is not to be suffered.

Of late, many loud noises have been heard regarding human morality and our flag. Also, many have held forth on the rights of this Nation on the high seas and in international imbroglios of just this sort.

Are we to allow such a series of acts to go unprotested? Are we to allow American nationals to suffer such treatment? Why was the Iraqi regime not put on notice to release these citizens? Have we sunk so low?

Mr. President, I am astonished by such sufferance on our part of such an act by such a regime. After their recent acts, they show clearly why the Israelis have followed certain policies. When dealing with people who have such contempt for human rights and international law, there is a necessity for straight talk. Regimes which make public spectacles out of executions, hanging the bodies of innocent victims from the gates of a city, leave civilized nations little choice.

Our Government must forthwith demand the release of these people by Iraq. Our Nation should let these people know that we shall not suffer their arrogance and criminal behavior toward American citizens. Such persecutions and arrogant behavior belong to another age, and should be treated accordingly.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXII

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the pending question, which the clerk will state.

The BILL CLERK. A motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 11, to amend rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

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

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

AUTHORITY FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, during the adjournment of the Senate from the close of business today until 12 o'clock noon Friday next, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States.

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

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the President of the United States will visit the Chamber shortly after 1:30 p.m. today. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

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

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 1 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m., when called to order by the Vice President.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

At 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m., the President of the United States, accompanied by the majority and minority leaders, the Sergeant at Arms, the secretary for the majority and the secretary for the minority, entered the Chamber and was escorted to the seat of the minority leader. [Applause, Senators rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we are honored today by an informal visit by the President of the United States. On yesterday, he visited the House. They had an informal luncheon there, and he was then escorted to the floor, and I apprehend that he may have made some remarks on that occasion.

Today it is our delight and our pleasure to have him here. I am doubly delighted that he comes back to revisit the Senate and the old haunts where he carried on for 2 years as a Senator and for 8 years as the Presiding Officer of the Senate. I am sure that none of his past sins will catch up with him. They have faded into sweet memory by now.

I am delighted indeed that both sides can extend the hand of fellowship today and that we could have the leaders on both sides of the aisle come to an informal luncheon, and there put aside all of the public business, politics, and everything else and just steep ourselves in jollification and pleasant memories.

Before I present the President of the United States, I take it that our distinguished majority leader would like to add to what I have had to say. I yield to him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President—and Mr. President; I am delighted on the part of the membership on this side of the aisle to join with the distinguished Republican leader of the Senate to express our appreciation to him for inviting us to a luncheon in his chambers and to express our appreciation to the President of the United States for honoring us with a visit this afternoon.

I have known the President for all of the years that he has been in Washington, except for his service in the Navy. We served in the House together. We served in the Senate. It is a pleasure to state that so far as this side of the aisle is concerned, Mr. President, we want you to know that we will do everything we can to make you a good President and a great President, because we feel that if you are good and/or great, the Nation will benefit. So we feel that we have a responsibility to do everything we can in the line of being of assistance. I want to assure you that that will be the policy, so far as I am concerned, on this side of the aisle at all times.

There will be differences on occasion, but when there are, we will try to be constructively different ourselves. Our basic desire is the welfare of the Nation. We look upon you as our President, and we will do our best to see that this visit of yours will be repaid many, many times.

Thank you, sir, for coming. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is always a danger in trying to be poetic and romantic and alliterative, and to turn a nice phrase. I am afraid that a penchant for that caused me some shame this week, because I stated, I believe in the Press Gallery, that the President is the only President since Andrew Johnson who served in both the House and the Senate. How I could have made that mistake and why all contemporary feelings suddenly have escaped me is beyond me, because I should have known, having served with the late and beloved John Fitzgerald Kennedy, that he, too, served in the House and Senate. And I should have remembered having served for a long time with Lyndon Baines Johnson in both the House and Senate.

I must now confess my shame in public so that all may see and so that I may contritely weep quietly, because since Andrew Johnson there have been two Presidents, besides our beloved President, who served in both the House and Senate.

So the President comes back to revisit the old scene. Having said that, I escort him now to the rostrum to say what he wants to say, or, if he prefers, he may stay right here.

President NIXON. I prefer to stay here.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The President of the United States. [Applause, Senators rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rules of the Senate, every former Senator is not only entitled to come to the floor of this Chamber, but is also welcome to come here.

This will be a visit from the distinguished former Senator from California, making sure that there have been no recent changes in the rules of this body, or merely checking to see if the chandelier in the Vice President's ceremonial office is doing its job.

Let me quickly assure you that the purpose of the visit here today is social—or perhaps it is for the sole purpose of obtaining a balanced meal not available in the White House. [Laughter.]

The Chair feels that he speaks for the entire membership of the Senate without regard to politics in welcoming to the floor the distinguished former Senator from California, the President of the United States. [Applause, Senators rising.]

The PRESIDENT. Mr. President, Mr. Majority Leader, Mr. Minority Leader, my colleagues, and my former colleagues in the Senate of the United States, it is a very great honor for me to return to this Chamber.

This is the first time that I have been in the Chamber since I left here 8 years ago. I shall also add that it is the first time in my entire life that I have ever been able to occupy this seat, the leader's seat. That is the reason I requested that I speak from here rather than from the rostrum, where I have spoken before.

I wanted you to know that as I look at the membership in this body, I remember the seat I first occupied. It was not in the front row. It was the seat now occupied by the senior Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY). As I see him there, I remember those early days back in 1951, when I came to the Senate and had the opportunity then, for the first time, to know many of those in this body and to learn the procedures which govern its tremendously important legislative functions.

I would also like to say one thing with regard to what the minority leader has

said in respect to how Presidents come from the Senate and House. I suppose he could have said that I am the first President of the United States since Andrew Johnson who had served in the House and the Senate who is a Republican. I am sure that is what the Senator was thinking of, because, as we all know, the Senator from Illinois never makes a mistake in anything that he says. [Laughter.]

I would also like to emphasize that as I come here I am well aware of the fact that the President of the United States has major responsibilities in all areas, but particularly in foreign policy, and that in the field of foreign policy, the advice and consent of the Senate is often required for actions that he takes.

I want to make it quite clear that during the years we will be working together, I will on many occasions require and ask for the consent of the Senate; and I will be here, either through messages, or in person in the other body in a joint session, to request that consent. But I want each Member of this body to know that I respect it, having been part of it, and still being a part of it; and that we in the executive branch of this Government need the advice, as well as the consent, of the Members of the Senate. We trust that you will give that advice.

As the majority leader has indicated, there will be occasions when we will not agree. However, the policy that eventually develops will be better because an alternative has been considered, an alternative which gives a choice. As a result, we may have honed the policy, the majority opinion, that eventually may be adopted.

I always have had the conviction that policy is improved to the extent that the man who has to make the decisions is presented not with just one agreement which has been ironed out prior to its coming to his desk but with a number of choices, so that his own thinking is refined.

I know from long experience that the Members of this body have strong views and that they will express them. I want to make it very clear that we will be most appreciative to receive those views.

Finally, I would end with one other thought, on a historical note: As President Johnson was welcoming me at the White House on Inaugural Day, he was talking about his plans for the future. I saw him there, a vigorous man, full of energy and full of ideas, and I realized that, as a man who had just finished the responsibilities in the highest office in this land, he might have some problems in finding activities that are adequate for the great abilities and energies that he has.

I do not mean to suggest that I am already thinking of retirement. [Laughter.]

I do, however, mean to say that when you see what former Presidents have done, it is interesting to note that one former President of the United States, John Quincy Adams, after he left the Presidency, came back to serve in the House, in a very distinguished way, for many years.

Another former President of the United States, Andrew Johnson, came back to serve in the Senate. I, at this time, will not choose between the House and the Senate. [Laughter]. But I will say this: Looking to the future and looking to the time when I may leave office, I would appreciate it if you would keep my seat warm, where Senator MURPHY is at present. [Laughter.] [Applause, Senators rising.]

RECESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

(During the recess, the President was greeted by Members of the Senate.)

The Senate reassembled at 2:20 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. GORE in the chair).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senate, we will now escort the President of the United States from the Chamber.

(The President, escorted by the majority leader (Mr. MANSFIELD), the minority leader (Mr. DIRKSEN), and the President pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL), retired from the Chamber.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCLELLAN obtained the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas will suspend. The Sergeant at Arms will please invite those who are not entitled to the floor to leave the Chamber.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Arkansas, but the Senator will not proceed until the Sergeant at Arms has cleared the Chamber of its visitors.

Visitors now in the Senate Chamber whose presence is not required by Members of the Senate will please retire.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will await advisement from the Sergeant at Arms that the Chair's instructions have been carried out.

The Senator from Arkansas may proceed.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING OF CERTAIN REPORTS BY THE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations extend the time until April 30, 1969, to file reports of its Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. These reports are as follows:

Improper Practices in the Commodity Import Program of U.S. Foreign Aid for South Vietnam.

Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders in Houston, Tex.

Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders in Nashville, Tenn.

Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders in Plainfield, N.J.

Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders in Detroit, Mich.

Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders in Newark, N.J.

Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders, OEO Grant to the Woodlawn Organization, Chicago, Ill.

Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders, OEO Grant to Wilmington Youth Emergency Action Council, Wilmington, Del.

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

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S BUDGET

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in presenting his budget message to the Congress on January 15 this year President Johnson predicted a $2,391,000,000 surplus for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and a $3,414,000,000 surplus for fiscal 1970. Both figures were based on the assumption that the 10-percent surcharge will be extended another year.

Today I shall point out that these projections of budget surpluses are but a mere mirage. They are based upon certain false assumptions and a manipulation of the figures, for the appropriation for the Commodity Credit Corporation, when taken into account, actually leaves us with not a surplus but a sizable deficit for both fiscal 1969 and 1970.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two tables giving a breakdown of these calculations, first for fiscal year 1969 followed by a breakdown for fiscal 1970.

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

1969

[In millions]

	Receipts	Expenditures	Surplus or (deficit)
Total budget, receipts and expenditures—Table B-1, p. 19, Budget Analyses	[a] $186,092	[b] $183,701	$2,391
Less trust funds—Table B-6, p. 24, Budget Analyses	(52,390)	(43,037)	(9,353)
Total Federal funds	[a] 133,702	[b] 140,664	(6,962)
Deficit for fiscal 1969			6,962

[a] Does not include $7,496,000,000 "Intragovernmental transactions," p. 19, Budget Analyses. Does include $500,000,000 basis 1-year extension, 10 percent surtax, p. 13, Budget.

[b] Does not include $7,496,000,000 "Intragovernmental transactions," p. 19, Budget Analyses.

1970

[In millions]

	Receipts	Expenditures	Surplus or (Deficit)
Total budget, receipts and expenditures—Table B1, p. 19, Budget Analyses	[a] 198,686	$195,272	$3,414
Trust funds—Table B-6, p. 24, Budget Analyses	[b] (58,693)	(48,431)	(10,262)
Proposed new taxes:			
Advance payment, Federal unemployment taxes from annual to quarterly, p. 13, Budget	(300)		(300)
Increased taxes, user charges, transportation, p. 65, Budget	[c] (400)		(400)
Raise 1st class postage rates from 6 cents to 7 cents effective July 1, 1969, p. 116, Budget	(519)		(519)
Commodity Credit Corporation discrepancy in reported figures, p. 231, Budget, as compared to figures used on p. 159, Budget Appendix		[d] 2,684	[d] (2,684)
Total	138,774	149,525	(10,751)
Actual deficit for fiscal 1970			10,751

[a] Does not include $7,881,000,000 "Intragovernmental transactions," p. 19, Budget Analyses. Does include 9,500,000,000 revenue derived from 1-year extension of 10-percent surtax, p. 13, Budget.

[b] Includes 1,700,000,000 receipts from proposed increased social security taxes, p. 13, Budget. Proposed increase: Effective Jan. 1, 1970, raise taxable base from $7,800 to $9,000; effective Jan. 1, 1970, raise rates from 9.6 percent to 10.4 percent, p. 8, Budget Analyses.

[c] New taxes on transportation, p. 65 of budget:

(1) Increase tax on passenger tickets from 5 percent to 7 percent effective July 1, 1969.

(2) Increase tax on gasoline used by general aviation from 2 cents to 8 cents per gallon effective July 1, 1969. Increase tax on gasoline used by general aviation from 8 cents to 10 cents per gallon effective July 1, 1971.

(3) New tax of 8 cents per gallon on now untaxed jet fuel effective July 1, 1969. Raise to 10 cents per gallon effective July 1, 1971.

(4) New tax of 3 percent as waybill tax on air freight.

[d] P. 231, budget: "Request is for full restoration of 1961 and 1967 unrecovered losses and all but $250,000,000 of the 1968 losses."

P. 3, exhibit C, CCC report, Sept. 30, 1968	1961	$1,057,047,170
	1967	2,210,668,971
	1968	*2,948,216,528
Amount required to be appropriated to meet objective stated in budget		6,215,932,669
*1968 loss		3,198,216,528
"All but"		250,000,000
Total		2,948,216,528
P. 159, budget appendix: "Appropriations (net): Reimbursement for net realized losses"		6,215,934,000
Actual request for 1970 appropriations: "Total price support and related programs," p. 231, budget		3,523,492,000 8,000,000
Total		3,531,492,000
Deficiency from amount described in budget		2,684,442,000

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, first, let us accept the assumption that the 10-percent surcharge will be extended another year, then let us examine fiscal 1969. As the chart shows, the $2.4 billion projected budget surplus for this year is arrived at by counting as normal Government revenue $9.3 billion accumulated trust fund receipts. When these trust funds are eliminated we find that there will be a deficit for fiscal 1969 of $6.9 billion instead of the surplus of $2.4 billion as claimed.

By no line of reasoning can the various trust funds be included as normal revenue for the purpose of defraying the daily operating expenses of the Government and thereby reducing reported budget deficits. These trust funds represent taxes paid by the employer and employee, and the Government acts only as the trustee for these funds.

The fact that the law requires that these trust funds be invested only in U.S. Government bonds does not mean that for accounting purposes they can be commingled with other Government moneys.

Under the law no administration and no Congress can divert these trust funds to defray the normal operating expenses of the Government.

Now let us examine the chart for fiscal 1970, again assuming that the 10-percent surcharge will be extended another year.

Here again we find certain false assumptions and a manipulation of the amounts charged as appropriations to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

For example, in fiscal 1970 we find total trust fund receipts listed as $58,693,000,000 against trust fund expenditures of $48,431,000,000, or an accumulated reserve of $10,262,000,000. This $10.2 billion trust fund reserve is counted in the budget as though it were normal revenue for the purpose of reducing the reported deficit.

Significantly this $10.2 billion accumulation in trust fund receipts for fiscal 1970 is based upon the uncertain enactment of President Johnson's request for a $1.7 billion increase in social security taxes effective January 1, 1970. Seven hundred million dollars of new revenues shown in the fiscal 1970 budget are based upon the assumption that Congress will enact President Johnson's proposed increase in transportation taxes plus the advancement of the payment dates of unemployment taxes.

President Johnson in his budget message has asked Congress to raise first-class postage rates from 6 to 7 cents effective July 1, 1969. This would account for $519 million in new revenue counted upon to reduce his projections for fiscal 1970.

The manipulation of $2.7 billion in the Commodity Credit account is broken down and shown as footnote (d) on the chart for fiscal 1970, which was made a part of the record earlier.

The Budget Bureau has tried to explain this $2.7 billion discrepancy in the Commodity Credit accounts on the basis that they are now dealing with a cash budget and therefore appropriations to cover CCC losses incurred in prior years should not be charged to fiscal 1970.

That argument would be valid had not the previous administration been ignoring these losses in prior years.

As far as the Congress and its Appropriations Committees are concerned and as far as the American taxpayers are concerned, the $1,057,047,170 unrestored realized loss for Commodity Credit Corporation in fiscal 1961, the $2,210,668,971 loss in fiscal 1967, and the $3,198,216,528 loss incurred in fiscal 1968 have never been recognized. The Comptroller General over the years has consistently criticized the Johnson administration on this point.

These losses were financed by the CCC with borrowings from the Federal Treasury, and when Congress appropriates the $6.2 billion as requested in fiscal 1970 to repay these loans then that amount further increases our deficit. The fact that these losses of earlier years should have been included in deficits shown for those years does not alter the fact that their belated recognition represents a deficit today.

Before the Budget Bureau can convert to a unified or a cash budget, they must recognize these previously incurred but unrestored losses. To proceed otherwise would mean that, as far as the taxpayers are concerned, there would never be a public accounting for the $6.2 billion in unrestored losses of the years between 1961 and 1968.

The Treasury Department would never allow any taxpayers to convert from an accrual to a cash basis for reporting his taxable income without taking into consideration the "notch" or necessary adjustment for the change-over to prevent unreported taxable income. The U.S. Government should abide by its own rule for private industry.

How can Congress appropriate $6.2 billion in fiscal 1970, yet only have $3.5 billion of this counted in the budget? Or to carry this point further, the Budget officials admitted that under this new formula Congress could even add another $4 billion to the 1970 appropriations to cover the estimated losses for CCC in fiscal 1969, or a total of $10.2 billion, and under this formula it would not change their projected surplus or deficit at all. Just imagine accepting an accounting formula whereby Congress can appropriate $3, $5, or $10 billion to this agency and then be told the increased figures would not effect or change the budget total one iota. What flexibility.

That is an absurd argument and one I cannot accept; therefore, I have included the $2.7 billion discrepancy in the CCC accounts when arriving at the projected deficit for fiscal 1970 of $10.7 billion.

This means, Mr. President, that, instead of having a surplus in those 2 years of $2.4 billion and $3.4 billion or $5.8 billion for the 2 years combined, when we eliminate the fancy manipulations and the various bookkeeping transactions which are not recognized in private industry, we find that the Johnson administration actually sent a budget message to the Congress on January 15 which shows a deficit for the 2 years of around $17.5 billion. I think this fact should be recognized by the Congress and

the American people when we consider the appropriations during this Congress.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. First, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Delaware on the exhaustive research that has gone into this rather brief and clear and concise statement on the true situation facing our country as far as the fiscal years 1969 and 1970 are concerned. But, to just point up a few key points, I would refer my colleague to page 8 of the budget of the U.S. Government. Page 8 is included in the budget message of the President. On page 8 it states:

> The 1970 budget proposes total outlays of $195.3 billion, made up of $194.4 billion in expenditures and $0.9 billion for net lending.
>
> Budget receipts are estimated at $198.7 billion in 1970, including the effects of extending present income and excise tax rates.
>
> Accordingly, the budget surplus will be $3.4 billion.

I understand, from what the Senator's analysis shows, that that sentence is wrong and it should read:

> Accordingly, the budget deficit will be something in the neighborhood of $10 billion.

Is that right?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The actual budget deficit for fiscal 1970 will be $10.751 billion, using their own figures, That is, assuming we do not raise postage rates—and I have not seen any bills introduced to raise first-class postage rates—and that we do not increase various user taxes by $700 million as has been recommended by Mr. Johnson.

But even if we enact all of the new taxes which have been recommended by the Johnson administration in his budget message and if Congress raises postage rates from 6 to 7 cents, as he recommended, it will bring in an additional $1.2 billion; yes, even if we passed all of his increased tax proposals and also raised postage rates, we would still have a $9.5 billion deficit. The proposed $1.7 billion increase in social security taxes is already counted in the trust fund accounts.

The best evidence that these figures were not overlooked by the administration in the final analysis can be found by a further examination of the budget message. In doing so one will find they are soon going to have to ask for an increase in the national debt limit of about $6 billion in order to finance these imaginary surpluses. If there were really going to be a surplus of $2.4 billion in 1969 and a surplus of $3.4 billion in 1970 they would not need an increase in the national debt limit—quite the contrary, we could drop the ceiling on the national debt.

But the fact that they are asking for an increase in the national debt at the same time they project these surpluses merely shows these projected surpluses as a complete farce.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. This is the very thing that prompted my curiosity. Here on page 8, we find the statement:

> Accordingly, the budget surplus will be $3.4 billion.

This figure, of course, was included in press releases that came out from the White House, and I am sure it appeared on the front pages of many newspapers. That $3.4 billion fictitious surplus has gone out to people all over the United States.

But when I looked to see what was estimated by the President as to what our national debt picture would be, I had to look clear over on page 494, and there, down at the bottom of the page, I find the estimate of a $6.5 billion increase in the national debt, subject to the debt ceiling.

When I saw that figure, I came to the same conclusion that the Senator has: How can we have an increase in the national debt if we are going to have a surplus? If we have a surplus, it would reduce the national debt.

So I think this is the real truth demonstrated by the Senator's analysis, although I think his analysis does increase the deficit a little more than that, due to this Commodity Credit Corporation account.

But there, in black and white, is the estimate of the President of the United States, President Johnson, that our national debt ceiling is going to go up $6.5 billion for fiscal 1970. The only way you can find that is to get into the operating account of the Federal Government. If the Senator will yield a step further, this very point came before the Joint Senate-House Economic Committee about a year and a half or 2 years ago. The then Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Fowler, was discussing the various types of budgets.

We all know that there are two or three types of budgets floating around. For many, many years we operated on what is known as the administrative budget. Then they developed a national income accounts budget, and there are one or two other types.

My understanding is that the national income accounts budget is one that is used in computing this $3.4 billion surplus. They take all of the income and all of the outgo for all Government operations, including trust funds; and some economists think that that is a better way to analyze the operations of our Federal Government than the old administrative budget.

However, I asked Secretary Fowler which budget counts when it comes to having to borrow money, and when it comes to computing the national debt.

Mr. Fowler said, "the administrative budget."

It is the national debt, and the financing of it by borrowing money, that lays the foundation for inflation. So if the American people are really interested in inflation—and I trust that most of them are—they ought to look at the administrative budget. They ought to pay attention to where the national debt is estimated to go. They ought to forget this foolish, fictitious surplus, using trust fund accounts, and look at the operating budget; and that is what the Senator from Delaware has done. I again commend him for the service he has rendered to the people of the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator. He is entirely correct. I wish to add that I think there are advantages in recognizing all these factors, as they do in the unified budget, to this extent: In the overall budget, the Government must recognize how much the Government, with all of its various taxes—income tax, payroll taxes, excise taxes, and so forth—is taking out of the economy and how much, through its spending programs, it is putting back into the economy. That picture stays in the mind of everybody dealing with this subject. It is in the mind of every member of the Finance Committee when we regulate and decide the income tax rates. We have to take into consideration how much social security tax and the amount of excise tax John Doe is paying. We also must take into consideration how much State income taxes, how much property taxes, and how much in various other taxes he has to pay as related to his $10,000, $15,000, or $20,000 income. All of those matters have to be taken into consideration.

But that does not mean we can figure all of that as though it were Government revenue. That is the fallacy of using trust funds to project a balanced budget. The trust funds can only be invested in Government bonds. For example, if the Government on the administrative budget—which is the true picture of expenditures for various programs—is operating at a $5-billion deficit in a given year and if the trust funds are accumulating a reserve of $5 billion in that same year, the fact that under the law these reserves can only be invested in Government securities assures the Secretary of the Treasury that in financing this $5-billion deficit it will all be done with investments made by the various trust funds.

In other words, he will not have to finance it with the public. Surely, he keeps that in mind. But that does not mean those trust funds can be used for the purpose of reducing a deficit. It is just as erroneous, in my view, for the Government to count the trust funds in telling the American people that we have a surplus as it is for a corporation to count its pension fund reserves in telling its stockholders, "We have a profit because these various trust funds have a surplus, and we are going to count it as though it were ours even though under the law we cannot spend it."

For the Government to report these trust funds as income is just as erroneous as it would be for one of our major corporations to include in its report to the stockholders the accumulated receipts in a pension trust which is set up and operated under independent trustees. The Securities and Exchange Commission and the Department of Justice would soon call to task any American corporation which tried to include such figures in its report.

I say the Government should abide by its own rules. By no line of reasoning can these trust funds be counted as revenue to defray the normal operating expenses of the Government in its various programs.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I think the Senator's analogy of a private trust and a private

corporation is very appropriate. But there is another point that I believe should be brought out here. As the Senator has stated, instead of going out to the general public to get financing needed to cover this operating deficit, at least in part it could get the financing through the trust funds. But sooner or later, the money that the trust funds have invested in Government securities is going to have to be there to pay off trust fund liabilities, is it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They are obligations of the U.S. Government which must be paid, just the same as when you or I buy a Government bond. The bonds when they come due must be paid; they are counted as part of the national debt. This budget message recognizes that, even though they have counted this money in projecting a surplus. They are also asking for an increase in the debt ceiling. Thus they recognize that these are obligations, the same as any others.

Our banks use Treasury bills and count them as liquid assets, but the Government does not count the amount of Treasury bills held by banks in New York or elsewhere as an asset for reducing Government deficits. We have to pay those off when they become due.

Mr. MILLER. And when those obligations are paid off, they will be paid out of tax money raised from the taxpayers, will they not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is the only source the Government has. That should be emphasized: Contrary to what many people think, the only source of income the Government has is money taken, either directly or indirectly, out of the pockets of the taxpayers. There is no mysterious source of income for the U.S. Government. Ultimately the taxpayers pay.

Mr. MILLER. I know that my colleague, the Senator from Wyoming, has been trying to get into the debate, but let me clear up just one more point.

It is true, is it not, that while Government bonds are held publicly, only a few out of our 200 million Americans own such bonds?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; except that a large number of people own series E bonds. Those are obligations of the U.S. Government. Those obligations are all going to be paid. They are liabilities of the Government.

But the Senator from Iowa is correct; the bulk of the Government obligations is centrally owned.

Mr. MILLER. The point I am getting at is that counties, banks, mutual funds, and individuals—only a relatively small portion of the population of the country—own those bonds.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The major portion of them.

Mr. MILLER. That is correct. So when they are paid off, all of the taxpayers join in paying off the bonds held by a relatively small portion of the population.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MILLER. Therefore, when some so-called economist disdains the analysis made by the Senator from Delaware by saying: "We just owe this to ourselves," he is not being quite square with us, is he?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I was never impressed with the argument that we owe it to ourselves. I point out that we will pay it ourselves, too.

Mr. MILLER. The point is that only a relatively small number of the 200 million people in the country own those bonds which will be paid off.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MILLER. So the majority of the taxpayers, those who do not own those bonds, will be paying a tax to pay the bonds off. That is the point we miss when we say that we owe it to ourselves. It is all right to say we owe it to ourselves if we mean all of the population, but only a small percentage of the population own the bonds.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. If all of the citizens owned an exact percentage of the national debt, then one could say we owe it to ourselves. Let us take the social security trust fund for a moment. The social security trust fund represents money that is collected from the employers and the employees. It is a payroll tax.

When that money comes into the Treasury, it is automatically transferred to the social security trust fund. Not a dime of Government money goes into that fund. The Government is only a trustee. Yet, now that there may be an estimated accumulation in that trust fund for 1970 of $5,247,000,000 the Government says "That is ours. We can reduce the budget by that amount."

That accumulation results from the fact that the large percentage of the workers today are young men and women in the age bracket, I would say, of from 20 to 45. They are paying their money today into the social security trust fund, thinking that that fund will be kept intact and that when they reach the age of 65 that fund will be able to pay for their retirement benefits. Certainly the reserves build up in the earlier years.

Likewise, the Railroad Retirement fund consists of taxes which are paid by the railroads and the railroad employees. It is a separate fund. The Government is only the trustee. These are not Government funds and should not be counted as such.

The trust funds must be kept intact. Yet they are being used for accounting purposes in order to report a good picture of a balanced surplus to the 200 million stockholders.

I say again that if any American corporation deliberately manipulated its figures in such a manner to give a false report of profits to its stockholders, the officers and directors of that corporation would be put in the penitentiary.

We pass laws about truth in lending and truth in packaging. I think it is time that we get a little truth in government and tell the American people what is happening.

I will go much further and say that if I felt we actually had a balanced budget and a prospective surplus for the next 2 years, without any manipulations, in an amount of approximately $2.5 billion for fiscal year 1969 and a surplus of $3.4 billion for 1970, I would be one to say that we do not need an extension of the 10 percent surcharge.

But we do not have any such surplus.

At a time when we are financing a war—and we do have to finance a war—if we were really going to accumulate a surplus we could not justify the extension of the full 10 percent surtax. But I think we need that 10 percent and have so stated many times. We need it because, looking behind the figures, even with a 10 percent surtax, we will still have a deficit of about $7 billion at the end of this year, and a deficit of between $9.5 billion and $10.5 billion in 1970.

We should tell the American people the truth. We should tell them where we stand. At the same time, Congress should recognize this fact and perhaps be a little more cautious in approving appropriations or expenditures for some of the programs.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator is correct. Many people think that a nice budget has been turned over to the new Nixon administration; that he and his new Cabinet officers, coming into office, have been presented with a budget providing a $3.4 billion surplus. People might think, "What a nice thought that is."

As a matter of fact, the Nixon administration is being handed a budget having a deficit of $6.5 billion. How this administration is going to stop inflation with such a deficit staring it in the face is, I must say, going to be a task for people who border on the Almighty. It will be necessary to find some way either of increasing revenue or reducing spending, so as to get down to a reasonably balanced operating budget. Otherwise, we shall have continued inflation and continued high interest.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Or a third method, which I mentioned earlier: to finance the deficit by further increasing the national debt, which it is recognized will be necessary. The debt limit will have to be increased to finance these deficits. But who ever heard of borrowing money to finance a surplus? I think that is so ridiculous that I am surprised that any such suggestion would ever come from the previous administration.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Delaware for yielding.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HANSEN. I wish to associate myself with the remarks that have been made by the distinguished Senator from Delaware and the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa. I recognize how important it is that as many people as possible understand the significance of what the Senator from Delaware is saying. We have been concerned with the effects of inflation in many areas. We took steps last year to try to cut back and hold the line on expenditures through the Expenditure Control Act, sponsored by the former Senator from Florida, Mr. Smathers, and the Senator from Delaware.

I recall many of the efforts that have been made in the last several years, because all of us recognize that inflation is eroding the purchasing power of the dollar. That affects old people. It affects people who are living on pensions and people who depend primarily on social security. All of these areas are of vital importance.

Would not the Senator from Delaware agree with me that some fancy footwork has been done in arriving at the budget presentation which was made by President Johnson, in which he indicated to Congress that 1969 would end with a $2.3 billion surplus?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HANSEN. President Johnson should have said, if he had been completely realistic and honest, so far as accounting procedures are concerned, that we would conclude this year, according to the best estimates I know of, with a deficit of almost $7 billion. Am I right about that?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. The $2.391 billion projected surplus for 1969 is based solely upon the assumption that the administration can count as though it were normal revenue the trust fund receipts totaling $9.353 billion. That is completely erroneous. It cannot be done that way. I criticized this procedure in January of last year. Before that, in the fall of 1966 I said that I thought the economy was getting overheated, that we needed an increase in taxes to help finance some of the cost of the war. I believe a tragic mistake was made when we did not finance more of the cost of the war at that time. We are paying for it in inflation today.

In January of 1967 President Johnson recommended a 6-percent surcharge, the Senator will recall. I endorsed it immediately and said I thought we should approve his recommendation, but 2 months later the President backed off. Finally, in January 1968 the Senator from Florida and I introduced a bill embracing the 10-percent surcharge and providing at that time for expenditure controls whereby we roll back expenditures by $6 billion.

We felt that we had both to raise taxes and to curtail expenditures in order to preserve the integrity of the American dollar. Had we not gotten that bill passed, which not only raised taxes but also controlled spending, the dollar would be in greater trouble today. I do not think we are out of trouble yet. I think that to a large extent the recent strength of the American dollar as we have seen it in the last few months is not altogether due to the improved position of the American dollar but because we are comparing it with weaker European currencies. The franc is weaker, as are some of the other European currencies, and as they look weaker our currency looks stronger.

We are not out of the woods yet. I do not believe we can afford to let the 10-percent surcharge lapse in the face of these multibillion-dollar deficits. I do not think we can afford to let up on the need to control expenditures.

It means that the Senator and I will have to do without many of the projects in our States which could be justified on their merits in normal times. But let us get to the No. 1 job—to get the economy and the budget under control—and then proceed to see how much we can afford in many of these programs. We have delayed too long in putting our financial house in order, and I believe we had better do it quickly, before it is too late.

Mr. HANSEN. If the Senator from Wyoming recalls correctly, despite repeated statements by former President Johnson that certain things were necessary, were indicated, and were required; that he proposed to cut back on expenditures and proposed to reduce the total Federal payroll, it was the Senator from Delaware who, after listening to these proposals for months on end, finally said, "If no one else is willing to sponsor the President's proposal in the Senate, I will do that."

Is the recollection of the Senator from Wyoming essentially correct as to what took place at that time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

President Johnson made a series of speeches. I complimented him when he said we had to control spending and reduce the overstaffed Federal bureaucracy. He admitted we had too many employees on the payroll and said he wanted to roll them back. Instead, they kept increasing so I introduced a bill to write his promises into the law.

I introduced the expenditure control bill, which merely put into law what he said he wanted to do. However, to my regret when we wrote it into law he did not seem to like it.

I still say that we need those expenditure controls. Without them our expenditures today could easily be $4 billion to $5 billion more than they have been in the past few months. We had a $6 billion rollback in expenditures in the measure, but we did lose a little of it during the watering-down processes or exemptions adopted in the succeeding months. But, to a large extent we are holding a ceiling on Federal employment, which I believe should be continued.

Mr. HANSEN. I compliment the Senator from Delaware for his continuing efforts in that regard.

I recall vividly time after time, in 1968, when efforts were made by individual departments of the Government and certain bureaus within those departments to have a particular part of the budget exempt from the application of the Williams-Smathers amendment. The contention was that very vital functions were being performed and that to require a cutback in the total Federal payroll or in the total number of Federal employees would result in certain vital functions being left unperformed.

As I recall, this argument was made with respect to the payment and the mailing of social security checks. Despite the fact that the Senator's amendment, cosponsored by the then junior Senator from Florida, Mr. Smathers, did not impose a specific and precise limitation on any one activity or function of the Government, is it not true that the limitation was a broad, overall limitation, with the executive branch being given the authority, upon the recommendation, I believe, of the Bureau of the Budget, to permit any one function or activity to have even more employees, if in the combined judgment of those in the executive branch it was indicated, and that the cutback would be achieved in other areas? Is my understanding correct on that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator's understanding is correct. As the author of the amendment, I know that the Senator's understanding is correct.

We wrote into this provision an overall ceiling on Federal employment. They did not have to discharge a single employee, but they would hire only three out of four resignations and retirements. This would gradually bring the total down to the July 1, 1966, level.

Upon the suggestion of the Director of the Budget, Mr. Zwick, we worded this provision to give him complete discretionary authority to make these cuts in agencies where they would least disrupt the public service, which was exactly what President Johnson had proposed in his Executive order—an Executive order which was never carried out until we wrote it into law.

With all the hullabaloo we heard that social security checks would not be mailed out due to the restrictions on employment and expenditure controls if the package which the Senator from Florida and I introduced became law, it is interesting to note—and the Department later confirmed it—that our amendment never affected a single employee or expenditure of the Social Security Administration. This is because they are employees administering the trust fund.

They later admitted that that was an imaginary argument.

Again, the Senator will remember that about the last week of July 1968, when we were voting in the Senate on the appropriation for the Post Office Department, the Postmaster General came here and said they were going to shut down the mail service unless his agency were exempted. In fact, he seemed so desperate some wondered if they were out getting options on some ponies to reinstall the Pony Express. They threatened to shut down much of the mail service if we did not exempt them from any control. I resisted, but the Senate did exempt the Post Office Department, and that great catastrophe did not develop.

I found out a few weeks later—I put the statistics into the RECORD—that in the last week of July, on the very day that the Postmaster General was threatening to shut down the mail service if the Senate did not capitulate and exempt his agency, the Department actually had 20-some thousand employees more on the payroll than it had the first day of June, 3 months prior thereto. They had been padding their payroll, getting ready for a rollback.

I become a little impatient with these bureaucracies. Perhaps many of these people never had to go out and meet a

payroll. They do not realize how hard the taxpayers have to work to pay these taxes. All they want to do is talk about how they can spend money; and they seem to think it is a crime if someone suggests that they save a dollar.

I wish to emphasize here as the author of the expenditure control package during the last administration that I think we needed it. I hope that this year, under our new administration, this movement toward economy can follow through. We still have to keep on the alert to make sure that our expenditures are held to a very minimum. We are now in a new administration—and I speak as one who is proud of this administration—nevertheless we cannot relax in the matter of control of our spending. I expect to follow through with the same position I took before. Of course, the No. 1 job is to settle the problem in Vietnam; but on the home front we must make sure we control inflation, and the only way we can control inflation is to control our expenditures at the national level. That must be done, and it has to be done in the Halls of Congress. We have that responsibility right here.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I compliment the able and distinguished Senator from Delaware for his leadership in this area. I think this is one of the most important tasks we are going to have to undertake.

I recognize, of course, what the Senator said about the settlement of the trouble in Vietnam. Obviously, that is the No. 1 job. The No. 2 job, I think, is to tighten up those things we do here in America so as to best establish the priorities which will meet the most pressing problems at home, and to do it in a way so as not to erode the purchasing power of the dollar, because that is where the people who can least afford to be hurt are hurt. The people we are most concerned about are those on whom most heavily falls the great burden of inflation.

The Senator spoke about the shenanigans employed by the Post Office Department last year. I recall a somewhat similar experience that developed in the last month or two of 1968 in connection with the Park Service, which is under the Department of Interior. I happen to be on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

We have two national parks in Wyoming and four other areas administered by the Park Service. We are very interested in what the Park Service does.

It was announced that the total Park Service employment was being cut, as I recall, from 6,205 people to 5,955 people.

The reaction of the Park Service was typical of the reaction of some of the other departments, including the Post Office, wherein it announced it was going to be forced, because of this manpower cut, to reduce the services it was providing for the public. It proposed to cut back 2 days a week during which the visitors could not visit such areas of surpassing national importance and interest as Carlsbad Caverns. These caverns were going to be available to the public for 5 days a week only instead of 7 days a week. The Park Service announced at the same time that there would be no definite opening date established for Yellowstone National Park, our oldest national park established in 1872.

The Senator can appreciate the dilemma this poses for people in my State, people in the motel business and the cafe and restaurant business, and all those persons concerned with the care and feeding of visitors to our national park areas, when they will be unable to tell anybody who wants to visit Grand Teton or Yellowstone the date the parks will be open. They said further they could not guarantee how long they would be kept open.

This is the first time the Park Service has not noted ahead of time a date definite and certain when the park would be open. I objected to this procedure. I said, "This makes about as much sense as to tell a dairy man, if he has been forced to tighten his belt a little bit, that the best way to cut expenses is to milk his cows only 5 days a week instead of 7 days a week." Of all the things the Park Service should have done it seems to me this is the thing they should have done at the very last. There are any number of areas in which they could have cut back.

I am not happy we have to diminish the services provided by the Park Service, but I cannot, in good conscience, support the Park Service in its contention that this is where the cuts will have to be reflected, in administrative procedure and management service by the Park Service.

I wanted to call the attention of the Senator to that situation because it seems to me to be an example precisely in the pattern that he has spoken of insofar as the attitudes of the Post Office Department are concerned. It is the same old story: "If you have a cut, cut it where public reaction will be most immediate and severe and hope enough pressure will be applied from the constituency so as to restore the cut, and then move ever upward and onward."

If we have money to do these things I say let us do whatever we can afford to do; but when we do what we cannot afford to do, when we are hurting people, as most assuredly we are hurting people in this country today, we are minimizing the power and force we could have been exercising in other areas in which the United States has a real and major interest by undermining the purchasing power of our dollar at home. Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do agree. The Park Service is a part of the Department of the Interior. How many employees are they supposed to be cutting? Is it about two to three hundred?

Mr. HANSEN. Something in that area.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is my understanding.

I would like to point out again that it is typical of the blackmailing tactics used by some of these spendthrift bureaucrats who know nothing but to spend money. I am not criticizing the employees in the field.

I refer to page 495 of the President's budget of this year. The Department of the Interior on July 1, 1968, had 61,186 employees on public payroll including the Park Service. The projection is that at the end of 1969 they will have 59,580 employees under this cutback, or a reduction altogether in all of the Department of the Interior, all the agencies, of 1,606 employees. Surely they can absorb many of these in the Washington office.

As I understand the situation, what they are threatening to do is to shut down the parks in America and put them on a 5-day week, expecting that Congress will get a lot of complaints from constituents and then hope to get their agency exempted.

As was pointed out by one of the officials, the parks to a large extent, are manned by employees on an annual salary, and if they shut down the parks for 2 days a week, how would this represent any saving? I say it is a part of the tactics where they single out the most popular part of their services to create the most disruptions.

Significantly, they fail to cut any of their overstaffed bureaucracies in the National Capital.

Perhaps we have too many chiefs in these bureaus and should put the chiefs out to handle the Park Service. Let us put them to work. It may do them good physically, and it would do the country a lot of good financially. I am not too much impressed with some of these spendthrift bureaucrats who as soon as they get a job want to expand their bureaucracies and then spend two-thirds of their time lobbying Congress for an increase in salary.

Mr. HANSEN. I have been pleased with the response and reaction I have received from personnel in the Department of the Interior. I have a high regard for those who work for our Government in the Department of the Interior, and certainly for those in the National Park Service. We happen to have in my State of Wyoming, National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Fish and Wildlife employees, and the reaction I get from them is exactly the opposite of that being enunciated by department heads and bureau chiefs.

They tell me, and I know a number of employees whom I have met not only in Wyoming but also in other areas, that there is no reason at all to close the Carlsbad Caverns 2 days a week, that there is sufficient help within the immediate area of the Park Service to reschedule and continue without diminution and without interruption the same sort of service that people have grown to expect from us.

They, too, are concerned about holding the line on inflation because they know better than most that if we do not do something about maintaining the value of the dollar, the salary increases they received last year will really not buy as much as they were able to buy the year before in terms of goods and services.

Thus, I salute these people. Obviously, they cannot come out and have their names placed before the public to say that they do not agree with the head of the Park Service or some other department head in what has been said, but they do tell me either through personal letters or through telephone calls that

they hope we can hold the line and will do something about inflation.

It is because of that that I want particularly to commend the great leadership the Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS) has brought to our country in this time of danger, and this time of inflation, when there are so many things we need to do and when the demands upon the dollar are as great as they have ever been, to try to bring about some fiscal sanity so that, first of all, the people of this country will understand what the true fiscal picture is.

It is in that context that I refer again to the Senator's figures wherein he calls attention to the fact that President Johnson indicated a surplus in his budget for 1969, an ending surplus of $2,391 million, when in fact and in truth it will far more likely end with a deficit of $6,962 million; and, further, for the year 1970, to which President Johnson referred, indicating there would be a budget surplus of $3,414 million, when in fact and truth it will far more likely be in the neighborhood of a deficit of $10¾ billion.

The Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS) is performing a great service to our country. If these facts can be driven home, if the people of the United States, because of his efforts, can better understand where cuts must be made and what must be done by Congress and the executive branch in order to bring about the stability which everyone yearns for so earnestly, then I would say that this has been indeed a worthwhile effort on the part of the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

I conclude with the statement that I think this has to be driven home to the American people. We are a great country. We are a great people. But our financial house is not in order. If the American people are told the facts about the dangers of inflation and how we have this deficit they will cooperate. All we have to do is lay the facts before them, and let them know we are really trying to reduce the cost of Government.

One other point on which I concur completely with the distinguished Senator from Wyoming—I am glad he brought it up—and that concerns the working people in the Park Service. They are not the ones trying to threaten Congress. I am very glad the Senator mentioned that, because I want to make it clear that I have great respect for those men and women in the field. In fact, it is those very people who have called to our attention the complete farce of this 5-day week for our Park Service.

As in the Post Office Department, my criticism was of the executive branch for trying to get that agency exempted when at the same time it had 20,000 more employees. It was not directed at the postal workers themselves. It is not the Indians to which I refer here but the chiefs who are down here creating these imaginary problems in order to expand their own bureaucracies. They are using these bona fide workers, those who want to do an honest day's work for the Government, as pawns.

Nevertheless, I think we must recognize that this is an overstaffed bureaucracy at the top level. It contains too many chiefs, and if we can send some of these chiefs out to do a little work in the field it may be good for them, and it will certainly be good for the country.

IRAQ AND THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a number of Senators are interested in expressing their denunciation of the executions which have just occurred in Iraq. Thirteen Senate colleagues, from both parties, have joined me in a statement which I will now read:

SENATORS DENOUNCE IRAQI EXECUTIONS

The show execution before a half million spectators in Baghdad today is not a single incident but the culmination of the bitter persecution of some 2,500 Iraqi Jews, the last small remnant of a once thriving community dating back to Babylon which asks now but to be left alone and live in peace with its neighbors. The concern expressed by Secretary of State Rogers and Secretary U Thant over the mass public executions of Jews and others in Iraq reflect, I believe, the abhorrence felt by the civilized world at such foul deeds. Even now the Iraqi have yet another opportunity to show some human compassion in the eyes of the civilized world by permitting the relatively few remaining Iraqi Jews to emigrate to freedom rather than to remain in a land where their freedom to work, to communicate and to move about is denied and where the very lives of those who remain are so threatened. The people of Iraq must know that the conscience of all mankind cannot be affronted by such bloody deeds with impunity for very long! The voices of anguish from within Iraq will be heard.

Senators joining me in this statement are: Senators MONDALE, DOMINICK, GOODELL, MURPHY, SAXBE, SCOTT, HART, PROXMIRE, RIBICOFF, TYDINGS, YOUNG of Ohio, MATHIAS, and CRANSTON.

Mr. President, the public-show hangings of alleged spies in Baghdad is a despicable act of the most barbarous kind. It takes us back centuries in history. It represents the most primitive kind of effort to persecute and to extinguish the lives of Jews and others of questionable guilt. It is very clear, though the Jewish minority involved in Iraq is very tiny, that this has the characteristics of a kind of genocide. I say that for the reason that, in the first place, world opinion has dismissed out of hand the transparent canard that the killing of these people has anything to do with their alleged "spying."

The Jews constitute an infinitesimal minority of 2,500 people in Iraq. Yet nine of the 14 who were executed were Jews, not that I draw any brief especially for them as against others who also lost their lives. Certainly it is very clear, however—and I will give the history in a minute—that the action against those who are Jews was clearly an action of spite, of temper, and of persecution.

Mr. President, here is some of the evidence on that score. The executions were the climax of the increasingly repressive treatment of Iraq's Jews which began a new phase of intensity in June 1967, following the Six-Day War.

The transparency of the proceedings in which it was alleged that these people were spies is illustrated by the fact that a so-called leader of the plot—an old Jewish man—can neither read nor write nor drive a car. He would hardly be the person to be entrusted with espionage responsibilities by the highly professional and sophisticated intelligence services of Israel.

For months the conduct, and even the ability of Iraq's Jewish population to move about, has been very severely circumscribed. Many have been fired from their jobs, removed from their business and professions, put out of schools, excluded from clubs and so forth. They have had their telephones cut off and are under constant police surveillance, and frequently are picked up for interrogation by the police.

Their movements are restricted to 4 kilometers, or 3 miles, from their place of residence; and they are forbidden to receive any income more than $240 a month with no remittances from outside permitted. A majority of the Jewish population has been reduced to living on welfare provided by their brethren within Iraq.

The critical factor is that all migration has been stopped by the Iraqi authorities. If Iraq really had any serious concern about a "security threat" from the infinitesimal Jewish minority, the quickest and easiest thing to do, and it would be welcomed with open arms, would be to "Let my people go," as the Biblical saying is. Just let them leave, as they are anxious to do. Israel is anxious to welcome them and give them refuge.

But we are facing a situation of a very clear persecution of the Jewish minority and what now begins to look like genocide. Immediately upon the heels of the world's protest regarding this matter, the only reaction one receives from the Iraqi Government is that it is planning more "spy trials" and more public mass executions.

Mr. President, our Government has denounced this shocking horror. Our Government has also said it is endeavoring to dissuade Israel from retaliation. I, too, hope that Israel would stand by, at least for a little bit, to see if the very clear expression of world opinion, to which we contribute by this discussion today, might somehow or other reach into the horribly twisted minds which have sponsored these terrors, horrors, and brutal acts.

There are other ways, however, in which some effect may be had upon Iraq. In the first place, is not this the clearest kind of illustration of the dreadful and serious responsibilities borne by the Soviet Union and France, which continue to be the principal suppliers of arms to Iraq? Does not the conscience of the world have a right to say to them, "If you suborn, support, and arm such a government, are you not yourselves tainted with the responsibility for what Iraq does when it engages in such crimes and atrocities as the public-show executions following trials in camera, which we have just witnessed?"

Mr. President, this is a clear illustration following many other acts, as to why the situation in the Middle East is one

of grave danger to world peace. This is why there is the most urgent requirement, of the highest priority and diplomatic effort by the United States, to see if it is not possible to bring an end to the conditions and the framework within which such atrocities as these take place.

I am not unmindful of the condemnation which accompanied the raid which the Israel forces made on the Beirut airport. I am not unmindful of the deep feeling of frustration and resentment which the people of Israel felt when the resolution of condemnation was adopted by the United Nations following that raid, because no account was taken of the action of the Arab States, including Lebanon, in harboring and officially sponsoring the commandos and guerrillas who have been shelling Israel and killing people all the time. It was from Beirut that the two guerrillas staged the raid on the El Al plane at Athens came—a raid which endangered the lives of not only Israel civilians but also of Americans who were in the El Al plane. One Israeli was killed.

Israel feels deeply resentful and frustrated because the United Nations has been quick to condemn it, but has not heeded to its longstanding plea for an investigation of the persecution of Jews in many Arab countries. For all practical purposes, the local Jewish population has been ejected from those countries and their property has been confiscated, with Israel their only refuge.

Also—and I say this just to be evenhanded, because I only give an account of the dreadful conditions under which this situation is festering in the Middle East—there is a situation in which Israel itself has its own problems, in respect of its own extremism. There is a newspaper report of shooting upon Arab women in the Gaza strip. This is a matter of the greatest regret, as expressed by Israel's Defense Minister Moshe Dayan, who promised prosecution even of any army officer who was found to have violated what should be his clear duty and clear authority in respect of that action.

So, Mr. President, this situation is boiling up. We must never forget, too, that in the Mediterranean the nuclear-armed fleets of the United States and the Soviet Union face each other. I was there myself approximately a month ago, and actually spent some time on an aircraft carrier. I saw the Soviet destroyer within a half mile off the bow of the aircraft carrier. The destroyer was there for only one purpose—to signal the position and activities of the American aircraft carrier.

This is the tense, dangerous, and incendiary condition that exists in the Mediterranean.

What the irresponsibility and incendiarism in this area is capable of is illustrated by an event which took place during the 6-day war. It will be recalled that during the 6-day war, both President Nasser and King Hussein were responsible for a broadcast to the world accusing U.S. aircraft of being engaged in war operations against Egypt and Jordan. Fortunately, the Russians knew this to be false, because they were monitoring every American aircraft carrier in the area. But that was fortuitous. Somebody with a quick finger on the trigger in the Russian Navy or Army could have reacted otherwise. It was perfectly clear that the information put out by President Nasser and King Hussein either was so reckless as to be culpable, or it was intended to entrap the Soviet Union into the war.

Now, Mr. President, we see the same mentality at work in Iraq. The "spy plot" for which these people were hanged was widely advertised last December by the Iraqi press, which is completely controlled, as being—I quote this from an announcement by the Iraq Government over the Baghdad radio and television in December 1968—"an American plot to overthrow the Iraq regime."

That is what these people were tried for, that is what they were arrested for, and that is what they were hanged for.

Mr. President (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair), it brings us down to this situation: Can we in the United States and can the Soviet Union arrest what seems to be the onward surge toward renewed tragedy?

The Soviet Union recently made a proposal with respect to the possibility of peace in the Middle East. The Russians, as we all know, are chess players—in their diplomacy as well in their game rooms: So what are their real terms? Their real intentions and their real objectives will only come out in time. What they have done so far is to ask the United States, Israel, and other countries to agree to an unacceptable proposition—one they know to be untenable. They say that Israel shall first evacuate the occupied territories and then the Arab States will give a paper declaration of an end of hostilities, and that this would represent at least de facto recognition of Israel.

After the disillusionment which followed Israel's compliance with the international mandates endorsed by the United States in 1956 and 1957 to evacuate the Sinai Peninsula, precisely based upon assurances by President Nasser, and because they were not even honored for a minute, certainly our country would not ask, and Israel would not comply if we did ask, with any such proposition. The Soviet Union knows it as well as we do.

We cannot assume that the Soviet Union is not interested in some resolution of the problem which faces both them and us in this area of the world. No matter what may be their motivation, I deeply feel that they do not want an atomic war any more than we do—and the Mideast situation could well lead to that.

Mr. President, it is my judgment that we must proceed to test Soviet intentions in this regard. There are ways to do it. I do not exclude, incidentally, the participation of other powers in the search for a meaningful peace formula, notably the United Kingdom and France, notwithstanding France's real perfidy in respect of its arms supply to Israel and the cutting off of that supply at a critical moment so dangerous to Israel's national survival. France nonetheless is an important power in the world and in this area, and must be considered. But the basic and heaviest responsibility will be upon the United States and the Soviet Union, the two superpowers.

There is a great difference in interpretation between the United States and the Soviet Union with respect to the basic document in the United Nations which seeks to set the ground rules for peace in the Middle East, which contained in a resolution dated November 22, 1967, unanimously adopted by the United Nations Security Council.

I now have the resolution before me and I shall refer to 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:

SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION,
NOVEMBER 22, 1967

The Security Council,

Expressing its continuing concern with the grave situation in the Middle East,

Emphasizing the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war and the need to work for a just and lasting peace in which every State in the area can live in security,

Emphasizing further that all Member States in their acceptance of the Charter of the United Nations have undertaken a commitment to act in accordance with Article 2 of the Charter,

1. *Affirms* that the fulfillment of Charter principles requires the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East which should include the application of both the following principles:

(i) Withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict;

(ii) Termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgment of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force;

2. *Affirms further* the necessity

(a) For guaranteeing freedom of navigation through international waterways in the area;

(b) For achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem;

(c) For guaranteeing the territorial inviolability and political independence of every State in the area, through measures including the establishment of demilitarized zones;

3. *Requests* the Secretary-General to designate a Special Representative to proceed to the Middle East to establish and maintain contacts with the States concerned in order to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement in accordance with the provisions and principles in this resolution;

4. *Requests* the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the progress of the efforts of the Special Representative as soon as possible.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Soviets say that the resolution means that Israel must first evacuate the territories which it occupied during the 6-day war in June of 1967, and that then the other operative parts of the resolution go into effect. I think the desire to interpret the resolution that way is strictly a service that the Soviet Union is trying to perform for its Arab clients.

But the U.S. interpretation of that resolution, which I think is the proper one, is that the various clauses of the resolu-

tion lean one upon the other, that the various clauses are interdependent, and that resolution is of an inherently integral nature. Mr. President, that interpretation would mean that the evacuation of the occupied territories must be a concurrent part of the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East which requires certain fundamental actions by the Arab States also.

There is further reference to the termination of all claims or states of belligerency, the territorial integrity and political independence of every state in the area, and the right of every state to live in peace with secure and recognized boundaries, free from threats or acts of force and the guarantee of freedom of navigation through international waterways in the area; and, very important because it has been one of the most nettling problems there, just settlement of the refugee problem. Finally, there is the guarantee of territorial inviolability and political independence of every state in the area, through measures including the establishment of a demilitarized zone.

Mr. President, in order to carry out the logical meaning of this resolution to which the United States was a party, and to really make it effective, it is necessary to have considerable continence about the various activities, including the retaliatory moves of Israel, the horrors of these Iraqi executions, the raids of Arab guerrillas, and so forth, which are jeopardizing the peace in this entire area. There will have to be a lot of restraint by us, as well as by the Soviet Union, the Arab nations, and Israel itself, if we are to come through this period without another war.

Now, Mr. President, we all understand that no peace in this area is going to be lasting or meaningful unless it represents something which the parties concerned themselves are willing to accept. There is nothing fruitful in the concept of an "imposed" peace.

The Russians think a peace can be imposed, or they say they think so. Israel would not accept such a peace because the terms of the imposition could hardly be satisfactory to her. Second, the Arabs would hardly treat it seriously and it would be treated as a tactic to lay bare the jugular vein of Israel until the Arabs were better prepared.

I deeply believe what can be done must be based on three principles. First, the United States, in the final analysis, must see to it that a reasonable arms balance is retained. That is why the sale of the 50 Phantom jets was so important. It reflected our determination to see that Israel would not be bested in terms of arms because the Soviets continue in a most reckless way to supply sophisticated weaponry to the radical Arab States which threaten to exterminate Israel.

The second matter, which is critical to that situation, is that, as we counsel the Israelis, we must be restrained ourselves. We must realize that one swallow does not make a summer.

Even though we voted for the adoption of the condemnation resolution in the United Nations, this should not be the basis for pushing us into an attitude of sanctions or other attitudes which would thereby play the game of the radical Arab States.

Third, the most constructive thing we can do now is to see whether, with the Soviet Union and possibly the United Kingdom, France, and others, it may not be possible to expand the instructions of Ambassador Jarring. He has said that he is operating like an itinerant post office. He goes from country to country. He gets a message from A and takes it to B, and he gets a message from B and takes it to A. But he himself is not endeavoring to bring about a settlement using the authority of the United Nations and all the nations backing the United Nations.

The Israelis have constantly desired direct negotiations. Perhaps that is unrealistic. If they desire it that does not mean we must insist on it. But there has been a technique tried which has been effective, and that is the technique of parallel negotiations. In other words, delegations of negotiators from various Arab states and Israel went to the Island of Rhodes in 1948–49 and negotiated, perhaps in separate rooms or separate facilities, but they negotiated to work out an agreement. That was an armistice.

We are now talking about some kind of peace but the technique remains to be tried. Therefore, it seems to me that the third thing we can do now to reduce the tension in the Middle East is to see that the Jarring mission becomes a negotiating mission in the same sense as the Rhodes negotiations of 1948–49.

I deeply believe that one of the great things about the people of the United States, is their admiration for the intrepidity, the courage, and the heroism of the people of Israel, that they only wish there were more people in the world, especially small peoples, and small nations, who had this kind of courage. But the people of the United States must know that bared breasts can stand just so much, that they cannot forever stand against jet aircraft, and the most sophisticated kind of weaponry which the Soviet Union is loading into the Middle East.

Therefore, the people of Israel need help. They need a sense that they will not be allowed to go down the drain, that in the crunch there are people in the world who care.

I deeply feel that the American people do care. That is why I have laid this matter out in such detail.

Mr. President, I conclude as I began, that the answer to the problems in Iraq, which we denounce, the many other acts which have so disturbed the American people, and the dangers in that area, is to bring about some kind of peace. To me, that is the No. 1 problem of this country, now that Vietnam is on the way toward some kind of settlement.

Mr. President, I have laid the bases and the ground rules under which I think we can operate to some effect, but more than anything else, it will take courage on the part of our people, too, to face the realities of the situation and not to flinch.

We should thank providence that unlike the situation we face in Vietnam, the Israelis can look after themselves, provided we help them and see that they have the means with which to look after themselves and sustain their freedom, and continue to be the greatest single bastion of freedom in that part of the world.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement the Secretary of State made on January 27, the statement of U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations, as well as an editorial from the New York Times.

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

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY ROGERS, JANUARY 27, 1969

We have had no U.S. representation in Baghdad since the government of Iraq broke relations in 1967. We are not therefore in a position to comment on the facts surrounding the trials. On humanitarian grounds however these executions are a matter of deep concern to us. The spectacle of mass public execution is repugnant to the conscience of the world. At my request Ambassador Yost has called Secretary-General U Thant today to express our deep concern and to tell him that we share the expressions noted in his statement earlier today.

U THANT STATEMENT, DELIVERED JANUARY 27

The following statement was made today by the United Nation's spokesman:

"The Secretary General has learned with regret and concern of the announcement of the sentencing and hanging in Iraq of 15 persons charged with espionage, nine of whom were Jews.

"In the view of the Secretary General, mass trials and executions are always to be deplored and are particularly abhorred and dangerous when they are carried out in such a way as to inflame the emotions of the populous. As soon as he had learned of the trials being held in Iraq, the Secretary General, on 13 January asked the permanent representative of Iraq to convey to his government the Secretary General's deep concern about them, and particularly about the impact they would have on public opinion both inside and outside Iraq.

"In the exercise of his good offices on humanitarian grounds the Secretary General did not question the right of the government of Iraq to put on trial any of its own citizens, as were apparently all of these convicted, nor could he attempt to apprise the validity of the charges.

"The Secretary General fears that the repercussions from this unhappy development will also be likely to impede efforts toward a peaceful settlement of the conflict situation in the Middle East."

[From the New York Times, Jan. 29, 1969]

BACK TO FIRST PRINCIPLES

The United Nations is returning to first principles with U Thant's call for big-power agreement on the fundamentals of a Middle East settlement as a prelude to further U.N. action.

The world organization was founded on the assumption that the major World War II allies would cooperate to maintain peace in the postwar world. Without such cooperation, the United Nations, as now constituted, cannot perform its primary peace-keeping function.

Fortunately, there is now some evidence that the United States and the Soviet Union the two superpowers, may be prepared to work together through agreement through the Jarring mission and in guaranteeing a settlement through U.N. peace-keeping forces.

This could signal an important breakthrough in the Russian attitude toward the world organization.

President Nixon has not yet disclosed the initiatives he intends to take, but in his first news conference he made clear his concern over the danger of a big-power confrontation in the area. Mr. Nixon put himself in an excellent position to press for a U.N. solution when he named Charles Yost as United States Ambassador to the world organization. Mr. Yost has served in the Middle East and has put forward sensible suggestions for a settlement there, stressing the U.N. role.

It should be emphasized, of course, that neither the major powers nor the U.N. can or should impose peace. The major powers, as Mr. Thant made plain yesterday, can only exert "moral" pressure for a settlement. If there is to be lasting peace, the Arabs and Israelis themselves must work out the terms for implementing the Security Council resolution of Nov. 22, 1967, which provides a framework for agreement. The role of the world organization is to facilitate negotiation through its mediator, Dr. Gunnar Jarring, and to offer guarantees of a final settlement.

What is needed now is frank talk among the representatives of the major powers at the U.N. on ways to strengthen the Jarring mission so that he can more actively promote agreement among the parties directly concerned on terms for implementing the 1967 resolution.

Only with Soviet-American agreement can any U.N. peacekeeping forces sent to underwrite a settlement be counted on to stay put in an emergency and guarantee the rights of all parties. Israel must have assurances that she will not again be exposed to a sudden threat of invasion or to deprivation of her right of passage through the Strait of Tiran, as was the case in the spring of 1967 when U.N. forces were abruptly removed from Sinai.

The United Nations can be an effective force for peace in the Middle East, but only if the major powers agree to make it so.

PEACE ON THE SCAFFOLD

While the major powers move toward a more active role in promoting peace in the Middle East through the United Nations, it is also essential that all parties spare no effort to restrain the forces that agitate for renewed warfare in the area.

The executions in Iraq constitute such a force subversive to peace. The secret trials and barbaric public hangings by Iraqi authorities, with Iraq's captive Jews as the scapegoats, go beyond any valid exercise of internal security. They violate all standards of justice and decency and aggravate an already grave international situation. In conducting these drumhead trials and executions, the Iraqis have put peace on the scaffold.

The United States has urged Israel not to retaliate against the Arabs for this brutal act. But it is even more important that Iraq's friends and arms suppliers—the Soviet Union, France and other Arab states—condemn this atrocity and use all of their influence to discourage any repetition.

Indeed, it is high time the United Nations took cognizance of long-standing Israeli pleas for an investigation of the mistreatment of Jews in many Arab countries and acted to safeguard fundamental human rights. Only when the world organization deals even-handedly with injustice and violence on both sides can it hope to play an effective role in promoting peace between the Arabs and Israelis.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I rise to associate myself with the views and the cause of the Senator from New York. That cause is not merely the cause of the people of one faith, the Jewish faith. It is not simply the cause of the people of one land, the land of Israel. It is the cause of the people of all faiths and the people of all lands.

All observers know that if the conflict that threatens so forebodingly in the Near East erupts, it could lead swiftly and directly to a nuclear confrontation that would involve this Nation and the Soviet Union. That conflict would threaten death not only to the people of Israel and to the people of the Arab states, but to the people of this land, of the Soviet Union, and indeed the people of all lands everywhere.

It is not merely a cause threatening and touching survival. It is a cause that should go directly to the conscience of all people everywhere, and perhaps most of all, to the consciences of the people in this land, because our unwillingness to do certain things at a past time in our history had a great deal to do with the emergence of the land of Israel as a place where people driven from Europe by the Hitler tyranny could find a haven and a home.

I happened to be in Adolf Hitler's Germany in the 1930's and witnessed, as a foreign correspondent, the atrocities directed first to the Jews, but very soon directed to the people of all faiths and all nationalities everywhere around this planet. It has always seemed to me that it was so much indifference on the part of the gentile world that led to the genocide that was directed first only to the Jews. It is that indifference that causes so many Jews to be fearful that once again such indifference may cause them to be subjected to terror and to atrocity and quite possibly to a process of being wiped out in the Near East through genocide.

I believe we have a great responsibility to show, by our deeds and the actions of our Government, that we are concerned; that we recognize the threat that exists in the Near East; and that we are determined to do all that we can through our Nation to preserve peace that will be just to Israel, just to the Arabs, and acceptable to all people. I believe that sort of peace is possible at this time in that part of the world, and indeed in all parts of the world.

I hope we can achieve that peace through the processes of the United Nations. I hope we can achieve it through understanding; through an understanding of the needs and the views of the people of Israel, and at the same time through an understanding of the needs and the views of the Arab people. I hope we can involve in such processes the government and people of the Soviet Union, because they have a stake in the Near East, as we have a stake in the Near East, as all people have a stake in the achievement of peace in the Near East. All the prestige and strength of our land must be devoted to that cause.

I agree with the Senator from New York that, as we long for the peace in Vietnam which seems perhaps to be within the grasp of our hands, we have perhaps a greater problem and a more severe task and a deeper challenge in the Near East. We must devote our greatest efforts to that cause. I believe we can do so successfully.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to my colleague from California, who comes to us with a great reputation for a deep study of the need for a national purpose and with a lifetime sense of purpose with respect to peace in the world. I think that has been quite well displayed by the remarks he has just made.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New York had told me he would speak today on this subject, not just to the question of the executions in Iraq, but that he would also make some suggestions toward a solution in the Mideast. I wanted to hear him, as I always do, although I shall not try today to respond directly to the proposals which he has made, and which he believes might lead to peace in that troubled area.

I am aware also of the deep sorrow and concern by which our colleague, the Senator from New York, is moved. Knowing his deep emotion, I have always admired the restraint that he shows when he speaks about affairs in the Middle East.

I know all of us, and people around the world, always feel a repugnance toward mass executions such as occurred in Iraq or the shooting of Arab women which occurred in the west bank last week. These senseless acts of violence lead to retaliation and to other incidents, and they serve only to exacerbate the difficulties and passions in that area.

Last fall I had the opportunity to serve as a delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations, and I had responsibility for one item, in the Assembly, which dealt with problems of the Mideast—the matter of the Palestinian refugees.

As always in the course of such a debate upon any matter dealing with the Mideast, there developed a debate over the larger questions of that area. While I have not visited these countries in the Mideast recently, I felt more deeply than I ever had before the passion of the people of all those countries, the tensions, and the difficulties that attend any settlement effort in the Mideast.

I was impressed, as never before, that the Mideast is the most dangerous area in the world today, second to our own troubled concern about Vietnam. As President Nixon said in his conference the other day, the Mideast is a tinderbox that could erupt into a war which would not only affect the countries of that area again, but could bring about a confrontation between the two great nuclear powers.

So I would agree with the Senator from New York that our country and our people must understand the danger of the situation. While today I do not intend to advance any specific views and plans that I have come to as a result of my experience at the General Assembly, I would agree with the Senator from New York that I doubt that there is any possibility of a settlement there unless it comes about through the influence of the United States and the Soviet Union. I would hope that a settlement could be achieved through the United Nations, in the framework in which the effort has

already begun, but, I repeat, I doubt that any settlement will occur without the efforts, and the concerted efforts, of the United States, and the Soviet Union.

So I am happy to have heard the Senator's speech today. I share with him his sense of concern over these acts of violence in the Middle East. I hope very much that all of us in Congress and in the executive, working together, can urge our country to use its best efforts and, as the Senator says, some passion, toward the settlement of this tragic problem.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very grateful for the comments of my colleague from Kentucky, who has a worldwide reputation, as well as a reputation in this body, for his calm, just, and very balanced evaluation of international affairs. It gives me heart that he finds merit in the basic thesis I have laid before the Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to close the discussion. Before I do, however, it is very important to emphasize the positive. I have always been very strongly for assistance in the resettlement of Arab refugees, and for the economic and social development of the Arab States. I hope I always shall be. The Middle East has the possibility of becoming a tremendously fruitful, prosperous, and happy area of the world, and I wish devoutly for nothing more than that.

I recognize that Israel is a Middle East state, and that her fate is intimately linked with that area of the world. I look forward, on the affirmative side, to a tomorrow in which all the peoples in the area may benefit from modern technology, engineering, development, and finance, which will come to them in enormous measure once there is some resolution of these dreadful concerns, and of the megalomania which some Arab leaders have.

The small nation of Israel can be of tremendous aid in putting the whole Middle East on a modern path; and that is the dream that I have, Mr. President, that this may yet be done. I shall do everything that I possibly can to forward it.

The real concern of people like myself is the fate and future of all of the people of the Middle East—Arab and Jew alike—and I shall dedicate myself to endeavoring to bring about some condition of greater security, peace, and development for them all, and some effort to rescue the tremendous Arab masses from the sea of despondency, hopelessness, misery, ill health, malnutrition, and superstition in which they have been immersed for so long.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I commend the senior Senator from New York for his most timely and important statement. Like the Senator from New York, I am shocked by the executions of Iraqi Jews reported from Baghdad on Monday. Secretary of State Rogers spoke for all of us when he declared:

> The spectacle of mass public executions is repugnant to the conscience of the world.

As the Secretary General of the United Nations has pointed out, such mass trials and executions are "particularly abhorrent and dangerous when they are carried out in such a way as to inflame the emotions of the populace."

Mr. Thant put his finger on what is so disturbing to all of us who deplore the rising level of violence in the Middle East. This tragic act in Baghdad can only make much more difficult the pressing task of finding a way to peace between Israel and the Arab States.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, I would like to join with Senator JAVITS in his statement condemning the recent executions in Iraq.

I am profoundly shocked by the mass trial and public execution of 14 persons, including nine Jews, by Iraq. I am even more shocked that the leaders of Iraq intend to go ahead with further trials of this nature.

In my opinion, show trials and public executions have no place in the judicial system of any civilized nation. These repellent methods should be consigned to the scrapheap of history, along with the lash, the thumbscrew, and the rack.

Besides being morally repugnant, I think Iraq's action can serve only to further inflame the explosive and uncertain situation in the Middle East. It will create considerable public pressure within Israel, as it obviously already has, for further retaliatory actions. It can only increase tension and add to the danger of war.

I am pleased that Secretary of State Rogers and Secretary General U Thant both have promptly condemned the hangings.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, the crisis in the Middle East has been seriously compounded by this week's mass hangings in Iraq. Secretary of State Rogers has spoken for all Americans, and I believe for all mankind, in condemning the outrageous group trials and public executions now taking place in that country. These actions can only contribute to further tension between Arabs and Jews. Although not all those executed as alleged Israel spies were Jewish, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that these actions represent a special vindictiveness against the small band of Iraq Jews and a distorted expression of hostility against the State of Israel.

There is reason to fear that additional executions will result from the latest charges against individuals said to be agents of the Central Intelligence Agency. From the outside it is impossible to assess the facts of the various cases, but it is evident that the practices and procedures involved raise profound questions of international law and morality.

Surely it should be clear to the leaders in Iraq and other Arab States that no civilized purpose can be served by such primitive exercises. Indeed they not only offend the conscience of nations who wish to achieve cordial and constructive relations with both the Arab States and Israel; they also tempt the leaders in Tel Aviv to find ways to retaliate for what they conceive as simple terrorism against their brothers in areas under Arab control.

Provocative and unjustified gestures of this kind must be avoided if peace is to prevail in this troubled region. It is hardly sufficient for Iraq to claim that these show trials and executions are exclusively domestic matters beyond the reach of international concern. That a state has the power to torture and kill human beings under its control is plain enough; that it has absolutely no right to do so without regard to fair judicial process is also plain. And the sentiment of mankind is obviously and rightly aroused in opposition to Iraq's methods in this instance.

The time has come for every nation in the Middle East to cease indulging in measures which wreak vengeance without contributing to peace, which vent frustrations in ways which only generate new frustrations. If Iraq and other states in the area value their reputations in the world and the prospects for peace in their strife-torn lands, they must begin to apply greater prudence and restraint in their national and international policies.

The tragedies of this week display the worst and most vicious instincts which afflict the human race. All men of good will should lend their efforts to see that they are not repeated.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. 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. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

SALARY INCREASES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the Salary Act of 1967, a provision was included which established a Commission for the purpose of recommending a change of salaries for Members of Congress, the judiciary, and certain top personnel in the executive branch. That provision provided for the establishment of a Commission. The Commission, in turn, would report to the the President its recommendations for changes in salaries.

The President, after receiving the recommendations of the Commission, would evaluate them and make his own recommendations, and, in turn, he was then authorized to submit those recommendations to Congress with the further proviso that the new salaries would become effective within 30 days after the President had submitted his recommendations to Congress unless during that 30-day period one House of Congress had taken negative action to disapprove this course.

In the budget as submitted on January 15 President Johnson sent his recommendations to Congress with the proposed increases ranging from 40 to 60 percent.

On page 167 of the budget for fiscal 1970, we find this language:

> The new salaries will become effective at the beginning of the first pay period after February 12, 1969, unless Congress acts to the contrary.

Recognizing this, and as one who felt that we could not afford at this time to increase congressional salaries, judicial salaries, and salaries of the top echelon of the executive branch by 40

to 60 percent as was proposed, I introduced a resolution the purpose of which was to express the disagreement of the Senate with these recommended salary scales.

I recognize that an argument has been made in justification of some changes in salaries. Nevertheless, as I have stated earlier today, we do not have a balanced budget for either fiscal 1969 or fiscal 1970, as has been proclaimed. On the contrary, we are confronted with a deficit at the end of fiscal 1969—next June 30—of around $7 billion and a projected deficit of around $10.5 billion or $10.75 billion for fiscal 1970.

Inflation has been rather rampant in this country. Inflation is the second most serious threat to our country. I place the Vietnam problem first.

I felt very strongly that the first order of business of this Congress should not be to increase our salaries by 40, 50, or 60 percent but rather that we should get our financial house in order. There is no use kidding ourselves. We cannot increase congressional salaries by 40 percent, as is proposed in this plan, and increase the salaries of the judiciary by some 40 or 50 percent, as is proposed in this plan, and increase the salaries of the top echelon in the executive branch by 40, 50, or 60 percent unless we at the same time are willing to face up to the reality that there will certainly be a request to increase the salaries of all civil service employees by at least 10 or 12 percent.

That represents an annual cost of $4 to $5 billion, or about one-half of the revenue to be derived from the 1-year extension of the 10-percent surcharge.

The Members of Congress and the members of the executive department should realize that if we increase our own salaries we cannot say no to the others. Carrying the matter a step further, if Congress increases its own salaries and the executive salaries by 40 or 50 or 60 percent and if we increase the salaries of other Government employees by 10 or 12 percent, the Government as the largest employer in the country cannot go to private industry and organized labor and say: "You should hold the line at a 4- or 5-percent price and wage increase in order that we may combat inflation."

Inflation is a great threat in this country. I think it has to be controlled; but I think the place to control it is in the Halls of Congress, and the top echelons of the executive branch must cooperate.

Congress should be willing to face up to these facts. The first order of business of the 91st Congress should be to put our financial house in order.

On that basis I introduced on January 15, 1969, the same day this recommendation came down, a resolution which read:

Resolved, That the Senate disapproves the recommendations of the President with respect to rates of pay transmitted to the Congress in the budget for fiscal year 1970 pursuant to section 225(h) of the Federal Salary Act of 1967.

Under the rules of the Senate, this resolution was referred to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for action.

We find in the rules of the Senate—and this is the nearest rule we can find applicable to it—that under the reorganization plan of the Hoover Commission it was provided with respect to these recommendations of the President's that if there were a resolution of disagreement it would be referred to the appropriate committee, but the committee was supposed to report this resolution back to the Senate with either a favorable or an unfavorable report.

It provided:

If the committee to which it has been referred a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan has not reported it before the expiration of ten calendar days after its introduction, it shall then (but not before) be in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of such resolution, or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to such reorganization plan which has been referred to the committee.

Mr. President, I want to be frank about the matter. After studying the rule and reading the law as it was put into the salary act I found it did not specifically spell out that the committee must take action within 10 days although it was understood by all Members that such would be the action taken by the committee.

After introducing the resolution I directed a letter to the chairman of the committee asking that the committee give consideration to this resolution and either take favorable or unfavorable action and then refer the matter to the Senate in order that the Senate itself could vote on the question.

I am disappointed that the committee, after holding this resolution 2 weeks, has decided that it will not take any action whatever. Apparently the plan is to let it die in the committee and thus let the 40 percent congressional salary increase become effective without Members having to answer a rollcall.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter addressed to the chairman of the committee be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., January 21, 1969.

Hon. GALE W. MCGEE,
Chairman, Post Office and Civil Service Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: On Wednesday, January 15, President Johnson sent to the Congress his salary recommendations under Public Law 90-206. On the same day I introduced Senate Resolution 17, the purpose of which was to express Senate disagreement with these recommendations.

It is my understanding that the Senate has but thirty days in which to act on this Resolution, which means that we must take action before the Lincoln Day recess. For this reason I am asking that your Committee take action and report this Resolution with your recommendations either in the affirmative or negative.

I am not asking that hearings be held on the Resolution, but should the Committee so desire I would be willing to testify in support thereof.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is regrettable that no action has been taken by the committee. I have been officially advised by the committee chairman that the committee does not contemplate taking any action and that it is their plan to let the resolution die in the committee. Presumably the plan is to prevent a Senate vote.

To accept this as the final conclusion would mean that we, the Members of the Senate, had delegated to the committee the right to make the decision for the entire Senate. All Senators should be allowed to express their own views on this particular subject. Certainly the question should be brought before the Senate, and I so expressed myself to the members of the committee.

Since the committee has decided that it will not take action I am now confronted with the question as to what steps can be taken to get a Senate vote. There are two steps which can be taken. One step is to submit a duplicate resolution and ask for its immediate consideration. I fully recognize that objection would be made to that unanimous-consent request.

Under the rules of the Senate—rule XIV—the resolution could be offered, unanimous consent could be requested for its consideration, and no doubt an objection would be made; but the resolution would automatically go to the calendar and be there for consideration on the next legislative day.

The second step that could be taken would be to offer a motion to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the resolution. In that event, the resolution would automatically be before the Senate.

The Senate has the responsibility to vote on these proposed salary increases. If a majority of the Senate feels that the resolution should be defeated and that the salary increase should go into effect let it so vote. Surely the Senate will not sit back and let the proposal become law by negative action, whereby all would receive a 40- or 50-percent salary increase but still be in a position to answer our constituents by saying, "I personally was against the salary increase, but the others were for it. I did not get a chance to vote."

I know Senators well enough to know that they are all eagerly waiting for an opportunity to vote on this most important question. I intend to give them that chance. So in order to initiate the steps for voting I submit a resolution which I ask to have read. Following the reading of the resolution I shall make a unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

S. RES. 82

Resolved, That the Senate disapproves the recommendations of the President with respect to rates of pay transmitted to the Congress in the budget for fiscal year 1970 pursuant to section 225(h) of the Federal Salary Act of 1967.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Objection

has been heard. Under rule XIV, the resolution will go over.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, as I have said, there are two steps that can be taken. One is to discharge the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service from the further consideration of the resolution. The other step would be to consider the resolution itself. I do not know just which step we may want to take, but in order that I may be in a position to make that decision later I now offer another resolution the purpose of which is to discharge the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I ask that this resolution be read. Following its reading, I shall make another unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

S. RES. 83

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 17, to disapprove certain executive, legislative, and judicial pay rates recommended by the President.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that this resolution be considered immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has been heard. The resolution will go over under the rule.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the situation now is that these two resolutions will go direct to the calendar on the next legislative day?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understand that the Senate will adjourn tonight; this puts these resolutions on the Senate Calendar. I hope to be able to work out with the leadership an agreeable time when one of the resolutions can be brought up for a vote. I mention that because since I am offering the resolutions it may appear on the surface that I am trying to take over or be antagonistic to the leadership of the Senate.

I know that the acting majority leader understands the parliamentary situation. This is the only procedure by which I can get these resolutions on the calendar or before the Senate. Therefore, I have taken this parliamentary procedure. This vote must be taken before the end of next week.

I told the acting majority leader that this procedure would not be attempted in his absence, that if he were not in the Senate Chamber I would make sure that he was notified because I realize his position is to protect the absent Members of the Senate. I can assure him that I stand ready to work out a date for a vote. I shall abide by whatever decision the majority leader and the minority leader want to work out as to the most convenient time for the consideration of these resolutions. I shall be glad to cooperate with them provided I can get their assurance of a vote.

I will be here Friday. I will be here all of next week. On the other hand, I emphasize the importance of some action being taken before we adjourn for the Lincoln Day recess at the end of next week; otherwise, these salary increases become effective after February 12. We must take action before the recess for otherwise, the law will automatically go into effect.

I conclude by expressing the hope that the leadership will work it out so that we can get a vote on Friday or at least by next Monday. I wish to cooperate with the leadership. All I am asking and insisting upon is that we vote on this question before the Lincoln Day recess.

I thank the acting majority leader for his cooperation, and I assure him of my continued cooperation so long as we proceed toward an early vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware has correctly stated the parliamentary situation and the developments which led up to his presentation of the unanimous-consent request and my objections, which were made by request, and which I had explained to him prior to his actions here today.

The majority leader is away from the floor at the moment, but I am confident that the majority leader and the minority leader will be glad to discuss this matter with the able senior Senator from Delaware and that, hopefully, some resolution can result.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY, JANUARY 31, 1969

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, January 31, 1969, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 29 (legislative day of January 10), 1969:

UNDER SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Russell E. Train, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of the Interior.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

Fred J. Russell, of California, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Jackson D. Arnold, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of major general:

Charles T. Hagan, Jr.
Arthur B. Hanson.

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Richard Mulberry, Jr.

The following-named (staff noncommissioned officers) for temporary appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Alvarez, Rodolfo, Jr.
*Appl, Ferdinand J., Jr.
*Asta, John J.
*Baldwin, Henry W.
*Beard, Charles E.
*Belfiore, James A.
*Bolenbarker, Luther A.
*Brooks, Johnnie D.
*Brummett, Boyd
*Bucklin, Gerald S.
*Burton, Allen F.
*Butler, Christopher P.
*Carman, Donald K.
*Chapman, William W.
*Clemons, Thomas L.
*Cole, Kenneth V.
*Coward, James W.
Cox, William H.
*Cunningham, Frederick M.
*Dankmyer, Charles A., Jr.
Davis, Ray H.
*De La Garza, Oscar, Jr.
*Desjardin, Armand H.
*Dunning, Eugene E.
*Dunning, James E.
*Elliott, Claude M.
*Fauver, Donnie L.
*Fisher, Clyde L.
Folsom, Ray E.
Fordyce, Robert G.
*Frederick, Paul L.
Fulcher, Charles O.
*Garland, Samuel M.
Glover, William S.
*Golec, Richard F.
*Gordon, Paul D.
*Haga, Gene H.
*Hamm, John D.
*Hammer, Armand M.
*Hinkle, Carl D.
Humeston, Bobby E.
*Hutton, James L.
*Jennings, James R.
Johnson, Jack H.
Jones, David F.
Kunkel, Henry L.
Laudun, Robert L.
*Lewis, Richard L., Jr.
Lewis, Vincent V.
*Linko, Joseph R.
*Lish, Thomas C.
*Lovingood, Howard
Mackie, Merle E.
*Mancuso, Joseph E.
*Martinez, Salvador, Jr.
Mason, Paul P.
Mathis, Jack D.
*Matlack, Jack L.
*Mattox, Chester C.
May, John P.
*Mazur, James F.
*McCrary, Billy R.
*McIntyre, Thomas J.
McQuerry, Thomas O.
Medor, Ellory M.
*Miller, Robert M.
*Mullins, William A.
Muschette, James, Jr.
*Neu, Melvin P.
*Oldham, James R.
*Paris, Thomas I.
*Pennington, Elhanan
*Perry, John D.
*Phillips, Jonnie E.
*Potter, Robert K.
*Quackenbush, John H.
*Ratcliff, Billy G.
Rawls, James A.
*Reese, Merle W.
*Rhoads, Virgil G.
*Richendrfer, Robert L.
Richter, Garlan W.
Roach, William L.
Sampson, Terrance M.
*Sandwich, Stephen A.
*Scott, Richard E.
*Smith, Herman W.
*Syring, Donald R.
*Waller, Frederick M., Jr.
Wetzel, Robert W.
*Wilson, Frederick A.
*Wisner, Hugh R.
Zickefoose, Bernard G.
Yates, John C.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Alderson, Richard L.
Alexander, Charles B., III
Avery, Michael V.
Barnes, Terry L.
Beagley, Larry E.
Beckett, Bruce H.
Bellegarde, Joseph F., Jr.
Bickmore, Albert H.
Boehm, Harold C., Jr.
Bowman, Thomas G.

Bozeman, William S.
Brewer, Donald C., Jr.
Brophy, Donald G.
Bryan, David M.
Burch, Gary C.
Burgess, Duncan H.
Butler, Robert C.
Buzzell, Kenneth E.
Caldwell, Don E.
Carlin, Victor E.
Clark, Charles B., Jr.
Collins, Michael J.
Curtis, Michael T.
De Neut, Richard E., Jr.
Dobrovolny, Kenneth R.
Dobrow, Robert H.
Drury, John E.
Dyer, George E.
Ellingson, Theodore D.
Erickson, Steven C.
Evans, Robert D.
Fish, Ronald C.
Fogg, Robert L.
Fowler, Michael A.
Friedrich, Edward R.
Garey, Robert B.
Glover, Richard A.
Green, Michael A.
Guess, Richard C., Jr.
Hacker, Dennis V.
Hamilton, John M.
Hardister, Edward L.
Hess, Theodore G.
Hieb, Ross J.
Hughes, Edwin D.
Johansson, Eddie E., III
Johnson, David M.
Kalish, Thomas B.
Kelly, James V.
Kerrigan, Dennis W.
Kingsley, Thomas E.
Kleber, Merritt B.
Kolczynski, Phillip J.
Lamphron, James P.
Levan, Kenneth B.
Lowry, John M.
Lucas, John F.
Mackie, Thomas W.
Magness, Robert
Makovitch, Ronald J.
Maloney, Michael V.
Matthews, Lyle B., III
McDonald, Peter R.
McDowell, Lane C.
McGuire, Walter E., Jr.
McLees, John H., Jr.
McMath, Wilbert D.
Miller, Paul W.
Mutchler, Robert S., III
O'Connor, William E.
Olson, Dennis O.
Parkes, Thomas J.
Pegan, Robert L.
Polachowski, Allan J.
Ray, Michael A.
Rickley, George R.
Roake, John M.
Rohrer, Michael A.
Rosenhan, Timothy C.
Santosuosso, Joseph P.
Schmeisser, William P.
Schneidler, Robert C.
Scognamillo, Frank (n)
Shetler, William A.
Shrum, Kenneth P.
Shutok, Gregory A.
Simpson, Victor A.
Soper, James B.
Spencer, Charles W.
Spond, Daniel F.
Spradling, Wallace H.
Sullivan, Kenneth M.
Tappon, Jimmy D.
Taverna, Rodney E.
Thomas, Robert P.
Thompson, Carter C.
Thompson, John L., III
Trask, Gordon W., III
Tuke, Robert D.
Wall, Richard F.
Ward, James J.
Watson, John T., III
Webb, Lewis T.
Wel, William
Weller, Charles T., III
Wells, David M.
Wilson, James F.
Wilson, Phillip H.
Yarrison, John W.

The following-named (Army Reserve Officers) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Parks, Garry L.
Plummer, Arthur M.

The following-named (Navy enlisted scientific education program) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Boykin, William W.
Culp, Ronald K
Fello, William V., Jr.
Hill, Patrick H., III

The following-named (platoon leaders class) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Aldrich, Robert H.
Allen, Thomas E.
Baldwin, Rignal W.
Ballard, Tommy L.
Bridges, James M.
Briggs, William D.
Bucko, Leonard J.
Bumgarner, George D.
Childers, Thomas R.
Christoph, William R.
Claborn, Alvie H.
Coffelt, Lyle M.
Cushman, Larry J.
Deubler, William F.
Drayton, Jerry A.
Dubrachek, Cyril P.
Feeney, John C.
Foy, Carey E.
Hagan, Francis P.
Hanson, Thomas J.
Hayden, Thomas C.
Kazonich, George
Labar, Terry D.
Lieb, Richard B.
Mittnacht, Charles G.
Moll, Roger C.
Moseler, Daniel J.
Mowrer, Charles D.
O'Rourke, Thomas A.
Osman, Henry P.
Pallo, Michael G.
Patten, Paul J.
Petit, Stephen E.
Reed, Charles G.
Rivenbark, Charles R.
Shaw, Kenneth W.
Smith, Stephen M.
Spiller, Thomas E.
Strong, Alan E.
Sullivan, Patrick
Sutton, Timothy D.
Walker, Frank A.
Ward, Thomas H.
Wright, Nolan W.

(NOTE.—Asterisk (*) indicates ad interim appointment issued.)

The following-named woman officer of the Marine Corps for permanent promotion to the grade of colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Dorothy M. Knox

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Ruth F. Reinholz
Mary E. Bane
Theresa M. Hayes
Irene L. Ray
Jenny Wrenn
Martha A. Cox

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent promotion to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Dolores A. Schleichert
Nancy A. Carroll
Jo A. Kilday
Karen G. Wheeler
Eleanor E. Filkins
Judith A. Sternburg
Nancy J. Mackie
Barbara J. Roy

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent promotion to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Sara J. Pritchett
Elsie M. Bounds
Judybeth D. Barnett
Della J. Elden
Melba J. Myers
Ruby J. Chapman
Susan M. Mason
Kate H. Renn

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

William R. Abele, Jr.
Andrew B. Adams
Sidney C. Adkins
Robert M. Akin
Jacob K. Albright, Jr.
Walter P. Aleksic
Joseph H. Alexander
Ronald L. Allen
George N. Allerton
Kenneth L. Ammons
William M. Anderson
Donald W. Andrews
Louis P. Andrews
Alfred A. Arroyo
Elie M. Asanovich
Robert B. Austenfeld, Jr.
Claude A. Austin
Edward V. Badolato
William W. Bahnmaler
James F. Baier
Mirza M. Baig
Alfred D. Bailey
Clarence L. Baker
Larry L. Baldwin
Ronald E. Bane
Andrew B. Banks, Jr.
Joseph L. Barker
Dwight D. Barnhill
Paul V. Barra
Connie A. Barsky, Jr.
Hubert M. Bartel, Jr.
Dean L. Bastian
Gordon D. Batcheller
Ernest B. Beall, Jr.
Leonard J. Beaudoin, Jr.
Duane C. Beck
Jesse D. Bennett, Jr.
Raymond H. Bennett
Donald D. Bergman
Alfred R. Bergstrom, Jr.
Thomas R. Betz
John C. Bever
Edward O. Bierman
Charles N. Bikakis
Wesley H. Birt
Alfred H. Bivens
David R. Black
Richard P. Bland
Robert N. Bogard
Paschal G. Boggs
Herman R. Bolen
Lawrence J. Boller
Norman H. Bomkamp
Walter E. Boomer
William T. Bosserman
Howard J. Bowden
James W. Bower
Wilburn R. Bowers
Martin L. Brandtner
Buford W. Braswell, Jr.
James V. Bronson
George W. Brooks III
George W. Brown
Austin R. Brunelli, Jr.
Ronald L. Bub
Richard S. Burgess
Francis M. Burke
George W. Burkley
Lou L. Burton, Jr.
Kenneth R. Buske
Larry E. Byers
Jerry M. Byrd
George R. Callison
Richard P. Carlisle
Robert A. Carlson
Thomas J. Carroll
Peter H. Cathell
Bernard J. Cauley
Alfred F. Cazares, Jr.
William F. Cerney
Moses Cervantes
Bobby D. Chambless
Calvin S. Champion
Wiley B. Channell
Bennett Chapple III
Clyde O. Childress, Jr.
Robert F. Christie
John L. Clark, Jr.
William B. Clark
Roger L. Clawson
John E. Clements, Jr.
Eric J. Coady
Robin W. Cobble
Bobby F. Cole
Vincent S. Coll
Larry M. Collins
Raymond L. Collins, Jr.
Edmund J. Connelly, Jr.
James F. Connolly
Billy F. Conner
Wayne A. Coomes
William J. Cooper
David C. Corbett
Robert S. Coulter
Robert A. Courtemanche
Donald C. Cox
William C. Cowperthwait
Frederick B. Craig
William B. Crane
Lyle P. Creadick
Oliver J. Crews, Jr.
Douglas A. Crowe
John F. Crowley
Richard O. Culver, Jr.
Francis J. Cunningham II
John R. Currell
Lowell R. Cushman
William H. Dabney
Jack N. Daniel
Donnie L. Darrow
Edward D. Dauksz
Howard L. De Castro
Albert W. Deckel
Christian F. Deffries, Jr.
William E. Deiuliis
Gerald De Jong
Cliff E. De Lano
David V. Denton
Michael G. Dickerson
John E. Dickins
Robert H. Dietrich
Ray I. Diffen
John D. Dobak
Christ G. Dokos, Jr.
Theodore G. Dopko
Bobby G. Downing
Robert J. Driver, Jr.
William R. Dudman
Hubert G. Duncan
Delbert H. Du Pont
Thomas R. Durham
Richard W. Ellison
Berlis F. Ennis
Charles C. Entwistle, Jr.
Donald G. Eirich
Walter M. Esser
Timothy J. Fallon
David E. Fanning
Barry W. Ferich
William I. Ferrier
Ernest T. Fitzgerald
John G. Fitzgerald
Matthew Flessner
Robert G. Flynn
Philip A. Forbes
Ellis F. Fordham
Raymond F. Fox
Alexander A. Frisenda, Jr.
Donald Fullem
David M. Gallegos
Robert B. Gann
Donald R. Gardner
Phillip E. Gardner
John W. Garriott
Frederic L. Gatz
Edmond D. Gaucher, Jr.
George E. Gaumont, Jr.
Harry R. Gentry
Timothy J. Geraghty
Joseph W. Gibbs III
Albert F. Gibson
Urban L. Giff
Floyd S. Giordani
Samuel S. Glaize
Richard Gleeson
Thomas E. Gnibus
Richard L. Goodlake
Bruce A. Greene
Clifford H. Greisen, Jr.
James A. Gress
James R. Griffin
Wayne G. Griffin
Edward A. Grimm
William A. Grubbs III
Ronald J. Gruenberg
John M. Gruner
Charles R. Gruning
Louis T. Gundlach
John W. Guy
Paul E. Hackert
Lynn M. Haines
Jack B. Hammond
Robert G. Handrahan
Herman G. Hannah
Chester E. Hanson
Richard I. Harris
Terry E. Harris
Harry G. Hartley
Albert E. Harwood
Barclay Hastings
George C. Hearn, Jr.
Marlin L. Hefti
John H. Helm
George L. Hemphill, Jr.
Nelson P. Hendricks
Phillip N. Hendrix
James B. Hicks
Thomas B. Hill
Donnal E. Hiltbrunner
Gene R. Hitchcock
Karl S. Holdaway
Maurice A. Holder
Kenneth D. Holland
Robert S. Holman
John M. Holt
Harvard V. Hopkins, Jr.
Herbert E. Hoppmeyer, Jr.
Frank J. Horak Jr.
Melvin Horowitz
Otis D. Howe III
Walter R. Hoyle
Carl O. Hubbell II
Richard H. Huckaby
Jerry E. Hudson
Frank A. Huey
Gerald C. Huggin
Longstreet M. Hull
Jerome H. Hummel
Karl H. Hutzler
Carl R. Ingebretsen
Leo R. Jamieson
Harry W. Jenkins, Jr.
Thomas F. Jessen
Anthon C. Johnson, Jr.
Donald W. Johnson
Edward E. Johnson
Gerald M. Johnson
Richard A. Johnson
Robert L. Johnson
Richard S. Kaye
John H. Keating
Alan B. Kehn
Charles F. Kellenbarger
Francis D. Kelly
John F. Kelly, Jr.

William M. Keys
Paul F. King
Willard E. Kinney, Jr.
Joe J. Kirkpatrick
Robert E. Kirkpatrick
Watt J. Kiser
Julius P. Kish III
Thomas W. Krimminger
Donald P. Klingler
Donald R. Knepp
William G. Kogerman
Robert C. Korman
Burrell H. Landes, Jr.
Virgil B. Lanham, Jr.
Robert A. Larsen
Donald H. Larson
James E. Lary
John H. Lawson
Robert Leiker
Thomas E. Lewis
Melton G. Lilley
Gerland E. Lindgren
Wesley A. Lokken
Francis L. Loving
Gary N. Loveland
Graden E. Loveless
Mark E. Loveless
James W. Lowe, Jr.
James L. Lumsden
Rudolph F. Lusk
Joseph A. Lutheran
John M. Lutton Jr.
Charles L. Lynch
Eugene A. Lynch
Gerald E. Mac Donald
Robert F. Machado
Maynard W. Maddocks
James T. Magee Jr.
John A. Magyar
Douglas R. Manning
James H. Marshall
John T. Marshall
Erwin J. Martikke, Jr.
John S. Martin
Billy R. Massey
Robert A. Mathews, Jr.
Claude A. Matson
John A. Maxwell
James E. May, Jr.
James S. May
Joel A. May, Jr.
Joseph C. Mayers
Michael H. McAfee
William J. McCarthy
Peter R. McCarthy
Billy L. McClain
John J. McDermott
John C. McDonald
Joseph F. McDonough, Jr.
James R. McElroy, Jr.
Robert C. McInteer
William A. McIntyre
Werner W. McIver III
Samuel K. McKee III
John L. McLaughlin
Paul A. McLaughlin
Charles T. McMullin
Ted C. McNeel
Michael E. McPherson
Clarence I. Meeks III
Spencer P. Mehl
Gilbert R. Melbaum
Martin W. Meredith
John H. Messick
Harry R. Metzler
Robert B. Mickey
Thomas P. Miller
Larry J. Miner
Roger L. Miner
Larry G. Mitchell
Alfred L. Mize
George D. Mock, Jr.
Robert C. Moore
Lawrence R. Moran
John D. Morris
Kenneth J. Morris
Lenus C. Morrison
Robert R. Mullins
Barry J. Murphy
John M. Mushallo, Jr.
Oran L. Myers
Joseph F. Nardo
Bobby J. Newsom
David B. Newton
Bernal J. Nichol, Jr.
Robert K. Nixon
Philip L. Noggle
Vincent P. Nolan
David S. Norton
Robert J. O'Brien
Elton C. O'Byrne
William W. Ogle
Larry L. O'Loughlin
John H. Olin, Jr.
Raymond A. O'Neill
Samuel E. Oots
Alan L. Orr
William H. Osgood
Hugh P. Pate
Robert M. Payne
William M. Pearce
Jeremiah W. Pearson III
Bruce G. Pearson
Donald C. Pease
Lawrence E. Peterson
Ronald E. Pfrimmer
Albert H. Phillips
Joseph W. Pinson
Raymond G. Pinson
John Pipta
Charles M. Pisanchin
Stephen W. Pless
Reginald G. Ponsford III
Corbett G. Pool
Raymond E. Porter
Richard A. Prestera
Norman E. Pridgen, Jr.
David B. Prue
John L. Pyclor
Harold F. Pyle, Jr.
Frank J. Quadrini, Jr.
James E. Quill
David A. Quinlan
Charles J. Ramsay
Albert J. Ransom
Thomas J. Rauscher
John M. Reardon
John H. Redgate
Robert M. Reed
Thomas L. Reeves
Donald P. Reichert
John P. Reilly
Owen B. Renfro
Edward O. Reusse, Jr.
Richard C. Rich
Tom V. Richardson
Franklin D. Richey
Howard L. Richey
William T. Ridgeway
John D. Riley
Michael J. Ripley
Karl Rippelmeyer
Jules C. Rivera, Jr.
Ernest G. Rivers
George K. Robinson, Jr.
Charles W. Rogers, Jr.
Torrence W. Rogers
George C. Ross
Robert A. Ross
Ronald K. Roth
William B. Rowley
James R. Ruffini
Herbert H. Ruhl, Jr.
Jaime Sabater, Jr.
Joseph R. Sales
Lawrence R. Salmon
Norman W. Sammis
Charles W. Sampson
Phillip J. Samuels
Bert E. Sandvoss
Donald E. Santo
Joaquin S. Santos, Jr.
John F. Sawyer
Harold D. Scarbrough
Richard C. Schamay
Joseph G. Schamber
Peter G. Scharf
Gordon R. Schlagel
Robert W. Schussler
William F. Schwab
Manfred E. Schwarz
Theodore J. Scotes
Lawrence E. Seaman, Jr.
Olen A. Seay, Jr.
John E. Seeburger, Jr.
James T. Sehulster
James P. Shannon
Wayne E. Shaver
William C. Shaver
Louis E. Shaw
James R. Shea
James P. Sheehan
Darrell S. Shelor
Andy J. Sibley
Bobby G. Sikes
Lionel M. Silva
James F. Simpson
Jerry I. Simpson
Gerald W. Sims
Winfield W. Sisson
David T. Sites
John H. Slater
Robert W. Sloan
Hardy A. Slone
Frank M. Slovik
Leonard K. Slusher
Clyde D. Smith
Gid B. Smith
James M. Smith
Vincent M. Smith
William S. Smith
Munson R. Snedeker
Thomas J. Solak
Gary J. Somerville
Richard G. Sousa
Frank L. Southard
Billy J. Speights
Doyle R. Sprick
Norbert J. Spitzer
Richard M. Stacy
Donald R. Stanton
David R. Stefansson
Mitchell Steinberg
William C. Stensland
James J. Stewart
Donald L. Stiegman
Donald L. Stoner
Robert H. Strand
John H. Strasser
John A. Studds
Francis X. Sullivan
Harold D. Sullivan
Edward N. Sutton
Thomas P. Swedenborg
Michael L. Sweeney
William T. Sweeney
Warren E. Sweetser III
Robert P. Sypult
Jack K. Taylor
Lawrence A. Taylor
John Telles, Jr.
Frederick S. Tener, Jr.
Joseph R. Tenney
John B. Terpak, Jr.
Henry E. Thomas IV
Albert K. Thompson
Richard K. Thompson
Richard L. Thompson
Richard T. Thompson, Jr.
William A. Tilley, Jr.
Gary E. Todd
Henry L. Trimble III
James M. Tully
George E. Turner, Jr.
Lonnie S. Underhill
Thomas D. Ungar
Donald V. Vacca
Abromo L. Vallese
Rocco F. Valluzzi
John M. Vanes
James E. Vanfleet
Fredric M. Vann
Stephen J. Veno
Achille J. Verbeck, Jr.
Nat H. Vincent
Richard W. Vorreyer
Kimball R. Wakefield
Forest E. Walker
Hugh L. Walters
Richard T. Ward
Robert W. Wardlaw, Jr.
Michael F. Waters
William L. Waters
Robert C. Watson
Ralph D. Webster
Gerald A. Wessels
Philip S. Weigand
Evan C. Werner
Howard M. Whitfield
David Whittingham
Justin H. Wickens
Robert W. Wiegand
Charles A. Williams
Gary W. Williams
David J. Willis
William A. Wile
Herbert T. Winston
David L. Wiseman
Herbert H. Wood
Randolph L. Wood, Jr.
William E. Wright
Moffatt F. Wylie
David A. Wyrick
Anthony A. Yatsko
Gordon K. Young
Rafael Zalles
Roger Zensen
Kenneth N. Zike
Robert F. Zumbado

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James N. Bacon
John Koylades
Lawrence R. Moore
Thomas A. Nolen
Donald L. Rapier
Kelly J. Sanchez
Clyde R. Snodgrass
Bobby G. Turbeville

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Charles F. Abene
George T. Ackerson
Raymond Acosta, Jr.
Norbert H. Adams
Richard W. Adams
William T. Adams
Jimmie L. Adkins
Sidney S. Adler, Jr.
Dean R. Aggers
Ernest M. Aguayo
Richard M. Ahlers
Frank L. Ashue
James J. Ainsworth
Thomas E. Albright
Richard E. Alexander
Carl Allen, Jr.
Thomas V. Allen
Robert C. Allison
Phillip D. Allum
Otto T. Althoff III
George L. Alvarez
Juan C. Alvarez
Ronald S. Ambrose
James A. Amendolia
Byron A. Anderson
Carl W. Anderson
John H. Anderson
Lawrence R. Anderson
O. V. Anderson
Perry B. Anderson
Robert C. Anderson, Jr.
William J. Anthony
Gayle Antle
Gerald P. Aragon
Julius Arocha
Richard E. Arnold
John C. Astle
Darrell R. Atkins
William T. Atkinson, Jr.
Robert L. Axline
Rodney F. Ayers
George F. Aylward
Raymond O. Babineau, Jr.
Terrance W. Bache
William E. Backus, Jr.
Gerald C. Bacon
Barry H. Bailey
Ralph J. Bailey
Robert E. Bailey
Jerry K. Baird
Michael L. Baker
Vance Baker
Duane A. Balfanz
Ronald E. Balske
Charles D. Banks
Don Banks
Ervin R. Bantleon, Jr.
Harold J. Barber, Jr.
John S. Barber, Jr.
Boyd B. Bare
Ernest Barfield
Glenn C. Bargerstock
Dennis Barksdale
Robert J. Barnes
James W. Barnett
Windle W. Barnett
Lee N. Baronet
Harold B. Barrer
Bradley E. Barriteau
Donice R. Bartlett
Charles M. Bartley
James H. Bartley
Clarence C. Bartolomeo
Benjamin E. Basham
Irving A. Bassett, Jr.
James V. Bassett
John L. Bates
Ralph S. Bates
Frank M. Batha, Jr.
William O. Baughman
Arthur R. Baum, Jr.
Richard R. Baumbach
Janna R. Baumgardner
Rodney A. Beal
Theodore T. Bean
Robert E. Beasley
Robert E. Beatty
Benjamin W. Beck
George L. Begor
Charles H. Bell
Charles G. Beman
Raymond C. Benfatti
Donald E. Bennett
Donald R. Bennett
George J. Bennett
Robert W. Bennett
Ronald R. Benoit
Robert F. Benoy
Paul A. Berger
Kenneth W. Berkey
Stephen R. Berkheiser
Stuart C. Berman
Maurice F. Bernier
Thomas A. Berry
Cecil B. Berryman
George V. Bershinsky
Calvin J. Berton
Lee H. Bettis, Jr.
Donald R. Beukema III
Homer E. Bever
Albert J. Beveridge, Jr.
Theodore A. Bewley
Hubert D. Bible
Thomas E. Bickford
John A. Bicknas
David P. Bigler
Charles E. Billings
Norman K. Billipp
John A. Binder
Francis A. Bishop
Jerry C. Black
Robert O. Blanchette
Thomas M. Bland
Jerry M. Blanton
Philip W. Blaylock
John D. Bledsoe
Leroy E. Blessing
William Blott
John L. Blount, Jr.
Orville N. Blyzes
John T. Bobb
Leonard J. Bobbio
Henry M. Bodziak
Robert W. Boehm
Arden G. Boeker
Robert E. Boerner
Brent S. Bofenkamp
Lee A. Boise
Robert U. Bokelman
Richard W. Bolton
Richard D. Bondurant
Joseph Bonsignore
William J. Bontell
Max J. Rorek
William C. Borgman
Alfred J. Borowy
Norman L. Bottorff
Earl T. Bowers, Jr.
Ralph M. Bowling
Marion V. Bowman
Bernard G. Bowyer
Paul L. Boyer
Edward B. Boyle
Ellis J. Bradford
Joseph G. Bradley
Robert J. Bradley
Earnest W. Brady
Jack A. Brage
Charles A. Braley III
William C. Brandenburg
Dale R. Brandt
Sylvan K. Branson
Richard C. Brassington
Nelson E. Brayfield
Eugene Breeze
Joseph J. Brennan
R. B. Breshears
Patrick R. Brewer
Edward E. Bright
Garold N. Brooks
Robert D. Brooks
Nelson J. Broussard
Constantinos T. Brown
Donald J. Brown
Terrance D. Brown

Walter A. Brown, Jr.
William A. Brown
William N. Brown
Arthur Brownfield III
Joseph L. Brownlee, Jr.
Randolph D. Brunell
Clarence C. Bryant
John E. Buckingham
Leonard Buckley
Allan S. Buescher
William J. Buhl
Richard E. Buice
Jeat Bullock
Bernard E. Burgess
Roger R. Burk
Elkanah J. Burns, Jr.
Kenneth R. Burns
Charles A. Burr, Jr.
Earl L. Burton
Ronald R. Burton
Bonnie O. Butts
Joseph M. Byelick
Dwight R. Byers
Raymond J. Cady
William J. Cahill, Jr.
Walter J. Camp
Markham B. Campaigne
David M. Campbell
Donald J. Campbell
James E. Campbell
Joseph J. Campbell
William J. Campbell
Donald A. Camper
Ronald B. Camper
Emilio Candelario, Jr.
Joseph L. Cannava, Jr.
Robert H. Canning
James R. Cannon
Henry P. Capdepon, Jr.
Joseph A. Capistran
Robert J. Cappock
Anthony F. Caputo
Edward Cardoza
Nicholas F. Carlucci, Jr.
Nathaniel W. Carmen
Gary L. Carnicle
Thomas L. Carr
John H. Carrington
Patrick G. Carroll
John E. Carter
Roger E. Carver
Grover C. Casen
James J. Casey
Paul E. Cash
Charles R. Caswell
Ernest H. Cates
Dale G. Cato
Cleo M. Chambers
Justice M. Chambers, Jr.
Arthur J. Chapman
Laurel E. Chapman
Walton F. Chapman
James E. Charrier
Marshall C. Chase
Louis A. Chatelle, Jr.
Emilio J. Chaves
Jackson B. Chaves
Michael P. Chervenak
James Chickneas
William E. Christ
Joseph A. Cialone II
Frank P. Cismar, Jr.
Harold G. Clapp
Charles V. Clark
Elmo A. Clark
Duchesne P. Clark, Jr.
Stephen P. Clark
Vernon L. Clark
Thomas J. Clarke, Jr.
Wilfred J. Clifford
Allin L. Coffey
James W. Cole, Jr.
Charles F. Colleton, Jr.
Daniel J. Collins
Howard J. Collins
Joe R. Collins II
Earl W. Colney
Robert Colonna
Gerald H. Conner
Larry A. Connin
Jerry L. Conover
Dennis A. Conroy
John W. Consolvo, Jr.
Solomon O. Contreras
Marvin Cook, Jr.
Rodney Cook
Bertrand W. Cooper, Jr.
Eldon L. Cooper
George D. Copeland
William E. Copes
Joseph N. Corcoran
Kermit C. Corcoran
Alfred G. Cordes
Robert A. Cornell
Hubert C. Cornett
Robert A. Corral
Allen R. Coulter
Robert A. Courtney
Harry E. Cowan, Jr.
William V. Cowan III
Allen M. Coward
Ronald M. Cowin
Francis L. Cox
Frank A. Cox, Jr.
Rodger L. Craig
John F. Craiglow
Donald L. Cramer
Robert J. Crandall
Franklin D. Craner
Larry G. Cravens
Charles R. Craynon
Thomas W. Crew II
Winford R. Cribbs
Daniel E. Crockett
Ronald K. Crockford
John Crone
Charles F. Cross
Chester H. Crossman, Jr.
Roy E. Crostic
William J. Crowe
Fred R. Crowley
Louis M. Croy, Jr.
Eugene J. Cruickshank
Kenneth A. Cruit
Francis J. Cuddy, Jr.
Louis A. Culbertson
Harry W. Cumber
John F. Curran
Arol E. Currey
William E. Curt
Terry M. Curtis
Richard D. Cusick
Lewyn F. Cutten, Jr.
Ronald L. Czarnecki
Karl E. Dahlberg
Robert J. Dalton
William R. Daniel
Jackie T. Darby
Eugene R. Darling
Earl G. Darlington
Marvin L. Darrow
Glenn L. Darst, Jr.
Kenneth M. Davidson
Larry R. Davidson
Kenneth W. Davies
Albert E. Davis
Arthur T. Davis
John W. Davis, Jr.
Robert L. Davis
Samuel D. Davis
Thomas E. Davis
Richard C. Daugherty
Edward D. Dawkins
Edward S. Dawson
Larry A. Dean
Paul A. Dean
Ottie B. Deane
Marvin D. Deaton
Darwin E. Dederick
Romain J. Deffes, Jr.
James W. Defrank
Lawrence A. Dehart
Hubert D. Dejaynes
Ronald K. Delabarre
Luis A. Delagarza
Earl G. Delarue
Robert J. Deluca
James R. Devore
Charles R. Dickerson
Don E. Diederich
James G. Dillon
Walter R. Dillon
Robert D. Dixon
Leroy Dobson
Robert J. Dolman
James T. Donlan
Billy D. Donnell
Robert J. Doorack
Frederick L. Doran
Daniel B. Dorn
Thomas L. Doss
Robert L. Doup
Frank H. Dowden
Bryant E. Doyle
Robert D. Doyle
Charles B. Drake
Jerome Drucker
Thomas W. Drummond
Serge R. Dube
Floyd L. Dufore
Hubert Dugas
Michael J. Duggan, Jr.
William E. Duke
Donald R. Dunagan
James A. Dunn
Ralph W. Dunn, Jr.
Howard J. Dupre
Gregory Duran
Carlos C. Durazo
Bobby E. Dusek
Robert O. Dutiel
Robert W. Ebert
Frederick Eckersen
Robert L. Eckert
George M. Eckman
Robert I. Edwards
John B. Egan
Melvin L. Ell
Bruce L. Ellis
Thurlow D. Ellis
William F. Ellis, Jr.
Robert W. Elms
Edwin E. Eloe
John B. Emeney
John P. Emmett, Jr.
John E. Ennis
Patrick E. Ennis
Thomas J. Entwisle
Bruce T. Ericsson
George J. Eschenfelder
Richard E. Esler
Richard G. Esler
Roy D. Esmond
Manuel Estela
Leroy E. Eubank
David P. Evans
Zane L. Everett
Clifford L. Fagen
Myrl G. Fairbrother, Jr.
James A. Fairley, Jr.
Lewis J. Fallon, Jr.
John T. Fanning
Elwood D. Farra
William T. Farrow
Jon H. Fasnacht
John Fasulo
Charles W. Fattig
Dwight G. Faylor
Joseph F. Featherston, Jr.
Ralph L. Fecke
Helmuts A. Feifs
David E. Feiring
Barry E. Fellinger
Ronald S. Fenn
Walter J. Fernandez III
William J. Ferral
Douglas R. Ferree
Harry R. Ferree
Ralph E. Fields, Jr.
James W. Filicko
Andrew R. Finlayson
Charles E. Finney
John L. Fischer, Jr.
Robert C. Fischer
Ronald F. Fisher
William C. Fite III
Joseph C. Fitzsimmons, Jr.
John K. French
Paul S. Flaherty
Wolfgang H. Fleck
William G. Fleskes
Jack L. Fletcher
John D. Flinn
Jerry D. Floe
William E. Flournoy
Robert H. Fontenot
Robert C. Foo
Norman R. Ford
Robert Ford
Philip L. Foss
Robert P. Foster
Wesley L. Fox
Robert C. Frame
Thomas L. Franklin
William D. Franks
Robert L. Frantz
John P. Freitas
Richard T. Friedl
David L. Ford
Marvin P. Fortson
Donald E. Frost
Franklin J. Fugera
Carlton W. Fulford, Jr.
James D. Fulmer
Erich E. Gabrys
Leo P. Gagnon
Richard S. Galang, Jr.
Michael P. Galasky
Cornelius J. Gallagher
Craig D. Gallan
Joseph C. Gallo
Jerry C. Gambrell
Joseph E. Garavaglia
Arthur Garcia
Johnny Garcia
Bernard E. Gardner
John T. Garon
Robert L. Garcutte
Edward Garr
Robert T. Garrow
Donald T. Gatton
Michael H. Gavlick
Ivan E. Gaylord
Harold S. Gazaway
Robert J. George
Howard L. Gerlach
Frederick C. Gassner
Charles D. Getchey
Patrick F. Gibbard
Robert L. Gibson
Roy Gibson
Henry P. Giedzinski
Michael Gierczynski
Earl E. Giles
Robert W. Gillespie II
Daniel C. Gilmour
Lester Gilstrap
Charles E. Girardot
John P. Glasgow, Jr.
Robert T. Glasgow
Billie J. Goble
Woodruff C. Goble
Robert C. Godfrey
Richard L. Godsil
Stanley W. Godsil
Virgil L. Goewey
Charles N. Goff
Tom A. Golden
Manuel Gonsalves
Gilberto Gonzalez
Loyal W. Good
Elbert R. Goodall
Monroe A. Goodman
Samuel M. Gordon
William M. Gore
Ronald W. Gould
Joaquin C. Gracida
Alan N. Graham
John D. Graham
William L. Graham
Perry H. Graves III
Wayne K. Gray
Billy D. Green
Jack C. Green
James R. Green
Ray H. Green
Harvey E. Greenawalt
Abie R. Gregory
Bruce E. Griesmer
Charles L. Griffin
Charles R. Griffin, Jr.
Bryan D. Griffith
James H. Griffith
John A. Griffith III
Bobby J. Griggs
Jessie Grimes
Richard L. Grivner
Robert W. Groom
Francis E. Gross
James W. Groulx
James D. Guerin, Sr.
Raymond A. Guertin
Robert G. Gulley
Robert M. Gulley
Richard J. Gustafson
Roger A. Guth
Robert E. Gwaltney
Fred Gypin, Jr.
Richard O. Haack
Thomas J. Hager
Jerald J. Haggerty
James C. Hajduk
Edmund D. Hale
George Haliscak
Jesse B. Hall, Jr.
William R. Halterman
Roland L. Hamel
Robert E. Hamilton
Troy B. Hamm
Walter R. Hampton
John C. Hancock, Jr.
Emmett L. Haney
Thomas J. Hankins
Thomas E. Hann
Thomas J. Hanrahan
Guy R. Hansen
James F. Hansen
George F. Hansford
Richard M. Harden
Bobby L. Hardin
Alan L. Harding
Eugene R. Hardman
Ronald E. Hardy
Kenneth L. Harmon
James S. Harrell
Don T. Harris
Lee F. Harris
Ralph Harris
William H. Harris
Willie L. Harris, Jr.
Leonard J. Harrison
Robert D. Harrison
Russell J. Harrison
Berne C. Hart
Roger M. Hart
Ronald J. Hartnett
Earl W. Hartzler
Orville L. Hastie
William M. Hatch
Joe H. Hatchel
Harry A. Haught
Harold B. Hauptfuhrer
Albert W. Hauser, Jr.
Robert D. Hawkins
Jerrald J. Hawkinson
Paul C. Haynes
Thomas E. Hayward
Gale E. Healvilin
Virgil I. Heap
Nathan E. Heard
Walter K. Hehner, Jr.
Henry Heidbreder, Jr.
Charles S. Heiden
Bruce A. Heitz
Ronald A. Hellbusch
Delbert D. Henderson
Jack R. Henderson
James J. Henderson III
Phillip G. Hendricks
Edgar W. Henninger
Frank E. Hensel
Richard E. Hensel
Miguel A. Hernandez
Dewey W. Heroy
James O. Hertz
Peter M. Hesser
Myles T. Hickey
John L. Hickman
Edward Q. Hicks
Arthur T. Hildebrand, Jr.
Peter Hill
Robert G. Hill
Robert T. Hill III
William R. Hill, Jr.
Dale R. Hiller
Albert E. Hilliard
Richard G. Hilton
Munn E. Hinds, Jr.
Edmond R. Hinkle
Harold Hirschmann
Norman R. Hisler, Jr.
Robert M. Hobson
Donald L. Hockensmith
Arthur D. Hodge
Jerry L. Hodges
Miles M. Hodges
Richard W. Hodory
Leo J. Hoedl
Jack Hofstra
Robert E. Holdeman
John Holderness
Jack Hoelzle
Frank D. Holiwski
James N. Holk
Kenneth B. Holland
Harold D. Hollis
Clomer J. Holloway
James D. Holmes
Stanley M. Holmes, Jr.
John C. Holmgreen, Jr.
Henry J. Holschen, Jr.
William A. Holt
Billy J. Honza
Raymond J. Hoogendoorn
Jerald D. Hopper
Theodore D. Hopper, Jr.
Walter S. Horsfall
Nathaniel R. Hoskot, Jr.
John C. Howell
Richard A. Hudson
Carl L. Huddleson
Walter D. Huels
James L. Huff
James W. Huffman, Jr.
Charles E. Hughes
William J. Hughes
Robert D. Hule, Jr.
Zane C. Hulcy
James G. Hulsey, Jr.
Richard E. Hulslander
Robert S. Hunsberger
William R. Hunt, Jr.
Charles E. Hurst
Donald R. Huskey
Thomas H. Husted, Jr.
Arnold A. Hutchinson
William C. Hutsler
John S. Hyde
Steve J. Iiles
Donald E. Imes
Alvah E. Ingersoll, Jr.
John L. Irons
Floyd D. Irvine
Frank M. Izenour, Jr.
Dennis D. Jackson
Jerald W. Jackson
Kaye E. Jackson
Marvin L. Jackson
Charles E. Jacobs, Jr.
George T. Jacobs
Arthur R. Jacobsen, Jr.

Theodore R. Jacobson
Christopher P. Jameson
Joseph J. Janis
Jimmie E. Janke
Donald C. Jarvin
Robert F. Jasmund
Harry D. Jeffery
Clifton S. Jenkins, Jr.
Walter R. Jenkins
Earl M. Jennings
James Jennings
Huston R. Jernee
Jack D. Jewell
Arney M. Johnson, Jr.
Carl R. Johnson
Dan C. Johnson
Dan E. Johnson
Donald D. Johnson
Donald R. Johnson
Harold B. Johnson
James E. Johnson
Stephen J. Johnson, Jr.
Weldon W. Johnson
William F. Johnson
Joseph D. Joiner
Charles M. Jolly
Harold L. Jones, Jr.
James D. Jones
Philmon E. Jones
Robert J. Jones
Thomas H. Jones
William T. Jones
William J. Jordan
Robert E. Joyce
Luis A. Juarez
John Kadlecik, Jr.
John M. Kaheny
Martin F. Kahl
Lawrence G. Karch
Eugene J. Kaus
John W. Kavanaugh III
Roger L. Keatley
Gary S. Kee
Richard L. Keil
John R. Keim
William E. Keller, Jr.
Jessie W. Kelley
John M. Kelly
Michael S. Kelly
Ralph E. Kelly
Richard M. Kelly
Samuel J. Kelly, Jr.
George R. Kemper, Jr.
Dennis R. Kendig
Edgar T. Kendrick
Robert H. Kennedy
William W. Kenner, Jr
George P. Kenniston
Arthur L. Kent, Jr.
Henry A. Kerchner
Samuel L. Kerr
Ronald R. Kersey
Jack Kettler
Meek C. Kiker, Jr.
Joseph W. Kim III
Thomas R. Kimball
Claude E. King
Claude E. King
James F. King
Wayne W. King
Gerald P. Kirchgessner
Michael J. Kirin
Harvey O. Kirk, Jr.
Gerald J. Klansky
Robert L. Kloch
William A. Knight
William J. Knipper
Roger E. Knowles
Charles Knox, Jr.
Joe J. Koliha
William L. Kramer
Kay E. Kramp
John J. Krauer
William Krelling
William L. Kroelinger
Ronald L. Krueger
Julius W. Kucinski
Norman K. Kuhlman
Robert J. Kuhlman, Jr.
Coleman D. Kuhn, Jr.
Billy H. Kuykendall
Robert P. Lacoursiere
John J. Lacy
Lawrence K. Ladd
Ivan A. Laing
Harvey L. Lambka
Everett E. Lamczyk
Billy B. Lane
Bobby Lane
James V. Lane
Warren R. Lane
Bruce A. Lange
Robert K. Lange
Charles E. Langin
Robert C. Langley
Timothy L. Laplaunt
Joseph V. Larkin
Richard M. Larson
Jerry L. Lastovica
Irving C. Latham
Roger L. Laton
Ronald J. Laughlin
Donald E. Laughner
Chester N. Laverty
Robert C. Laverty
Edmond H. Lawrence
Lewis W. Layton, Jr.
Shawn W. Leach
Jimmie V. Leal
Roger O. Ledoux
John J. Lee
Richard R. Lee
William E. Lee
William E. Legg
Walter V. Lemmond III
Donald S. Lenn
Joseph A. Leonski
Lawrence J. Le Page
James W. Le Wallen
Kennith D. Lewis
George S. Lidback, Jr.
Newton A. Lieurance, Jr.
Bobby R. Light
Ralph B. Lilja
Junior Lilly
Steven P. Lindsey
Albert J. Listwan
Herman I. Little, Jr.
Burdell L. Lloyd, Jr.
Edward P. Loftus
Bernard W. Logan
John L. Lohr
Richard P. Lonetti
Charles J. Long
Carl E. Long
Robert L. Lord
Frederick A. Lorentsen
Frederick R. Loughren
Charles Loustaunau, Jr.
John T. Lovell
Willis J. Lovitt, Jr.
William N. Lowe
David W. Loy
Arne B. Lucenius
Robert M. Ludwig
Frank W. Lukasiewicz
Theodore Lukawecz
Sellards L. Lumpkins
Robert E. Lund
Helmer G. Lundberg, Jr.
George L. Lunt, Jr.
Edward M. Luisa, Jr.
John H. Lusignan
Fred Lutz, Jr.
Maxwell C. Luxemburger
Hazen E. MacDonald
Larry S. MacFarlane
Herman E. MacKlin
Gerald Macky
Gary W. MacLeod
Ray D. MacPherson
Gerald O. Mallette
Loren J. Malone
Lewis D. Manbeck
Dale W. Manifold
James D. Manley
Daniel I. Mann
Thomas J. Mann
Joseph R. Manning
Donald C. Marchette
Gaylord J. Marek
Daniel Marland, Jr.
Samuel R. Marrone
John J. Marshall
David O. Martin
Donald J. Martin
Francis L. Martin
Horace W. Marvin
William R. Mascian-gelo
Michael P. Mastro-berti
Lawrence W. Matras
John T. Matthews, Jr.
Peter J. Matthews
Millard F. Matthews, Jr.
Dean H. Matzko
Charles L. Maxfield
Donald M. Maxwell
Sanford F. Mayfield
William T. McAuley II
William G. McBride, Jr.
William D. McCall, Jr.
Frank H. McCarthy
John E. McCarthy, Jr.
Richard C. McCarthy
William J. McCarthy
Joseph R. McCartney
Ramon V. McClellan
Jimmy W. McClung
Raymond B. McClure
Francis McCombs
Richard G. McCord
Donald W. McCormick
Billy R. McCulloch
Denis H. McDonald
James E. McDonald, Jr.
Donald T. McDonough
Patrick J. McElhinney
Bernard W. McFadden
Andrew B. McFarlane
Reginald K. McGraw
Henry W. McGee
John P. McGuire
James P. McInerney
John M. McInnes
Max McIntyre
Wallace L. McIver
Frederick R. McKay
John E. McKay
Joseph C. McKenna
Harry T. McKinney, Jr.
Jon E. McLaughlin
William J. McLaughlin
Edward L. McMenamy, Jr.
Jack H. McMullin
Thomas B. McMullin
Warren R. McPherson
Daniel H. McQueary
John R. Means
Eldon G. Medearis, Jr.
Joseph M. Medina, Jr.
Ralph D. Meece
Robert A. Meech
George B. Meegan
James M. Meehleder
Charles C. Meeker
Fred J. Meier, Jr.
Edmund M. Mello
John H. Mentzer II
Edwin A. Metcalfe
Edward H. Meyer, Jr.
Bradford B. Meyers
Donald J. Meyers
Edward L. Michael
John J. Mikulsky
Anthony F. Milavic
Arthur F. Millard
Andrew P. Miller
Ashby R. Miller
Burleigh W. Miller
Jerry J. Miller
Lester V. Miller
Miles T. Miller
Norman A. Miller
Phillip M. Miller
Raymond R. Miller, Jr.
Thomas J. Miller
William R. Miller
Peter B. Millichap
Donald E. Mills
Jimmie L. Mills
Thomas C. Mills
Ralph A. Milton
Earl W. Mitchell
Floyd G. Mitchell
James J. Mollendor
Harry R. Moller
Guy E. Moneypenny
Orrie G. Montgomery
John E. Moody
Rex B. Moody
David C. Moog
John F. Mooney
Edward L. Moore II
Fred A. Moore, Jr.
Kenneth W. Moore
Theodore C. Moore
William T. Moore, Jr.
Richard G. Moran
Francis T. Morgan, Jr.
Robert Y. Morgan
Robert G. Morilla
Richard G. Morin
Joe D. Moring
Charles A. Morris
Herbert R. Morris, Jr.
Allen W. Morrison
Jerald J. Morrison
John T. Morrissey, Jr.
Charles L. Morrow
Edward Morrow
Merrill T. Morton
Harold D. Morts
Don E. Mosley
Alfred H. Mossler
Bruce L. Moulton
Stavros S. Moungelis
Paul H. Mounter
George T. Mowry
William H. Moxley
Robert L. Mull
Richard J. Muller
Jerold A. Mulloy
John V. Mumford
Ted L. Munday
Marion E. Mundy
Timothy J. Murphy
Grover Murray
Richard E. Musser
Clair D. Myers
Glenn N. Myers
Arthur G. Nadeau
Thomas F. Nagelin, Sr.
Gary L. Nail
Gerald R. Naperalski
Gail L. Nash
Daniel A. Nazarchuk
Charles F. Needels, Jr.
Thompson D. Neff
Robert E. Neithammer
George Nelson, Jr.
Russell L. Nelson
Cecil Netherly
Alfred C. Neveu
Walter New
Gary L. Newkirk
Richard B. Newton
Donald D. Nicosia
Carl E. Nida
James F. Nienstedt
Joe A. Nixon
Leabert F. Nobriga
John F. Noel, Jr.
Phillip C. Norton
William D. Norton
Henry R. Nothhaft
Peter W. Oatis
Charles W. Occhipinti
Charles F. O'Connor
George R. O'Connor
Frank E. O'Dell
William J. O'Hara
John O. Olsen
Thomas A. Olson
Stephen J. O'Neill
John P. Oppenhuizen
Louis D. Orlando
Alfred W. O'Roark
Louis Orona, Jr.
James C. Orr
Robert C. O'Shields
Thomas T. O'Sullivan
Thomas F. O'Toole, Jr.
Clair E. Ott
Melvin J. Oubre
Nicholas J. Outrakis
Gerald E. Owsley
Lynn D. Oxford
Herbert M. Page, Jr.
Billy G. Painter
Doil C. Palmer
Harry L. Pancoast, Jr.
Paul Paquette
Bobby J. Parrish
Julian W. Parrish
Theodore Paskevich
Doyle M. Patton
James S. Paulk
Jack T. Paxton
Bruce W. Pearce
Delbert A. Pease
Walter A. Peeples
Paul R. Pelczarski
Conrad R. Pelletier
Perly A. Pelletier
William M. Pelto
Gerard G. Pendas, Jr.
Paul Pendergast
Thomas J. Pentony
Francis A. Pepe
Edmund T. Peregoy
William N. Perkins
Jack N. Perrin
Joseph Perry
Ronald L. Perry
Guy A. Pete, Jr.
Maxwell R. Peters
William C. Peters
Dennis A. Peterson
George L. Peterson, Jr.
Gordon F. Peterson
John W. Peterson
John A. Petronzio
Ronald J. Petzel
James M. Phelan
Lewis M. Phillippi, Jr.
Charles L. Phillips
Clarence W. Phillips, Jr.
Donald F. Phillips
Ennis T. Phillips, Jr.
Weller A. Phillips III
Adolph L. Plank, Jr.
Charles L. Platt
Warren B. Partain, Jr.
Ronald J. Piconke
Robert P. Pier
Arthur A. Pierce
John F. Pierce
Louis T. Pierce, Jr.
Charles W. Pigott
John E. Pike
Ralph H. Pike
John M. Pinkerton
Murry C. Pinnell
Leo G. Plante
Edward J. Polasek, Jr.
John R. Pope
Glaston Pool
Edward G. Poulin
Clayton A. Powell
Frank D. Powell
John A. Powers
Thomas J. Prendergast
Ralph A. Preston, Jr.
Paul J. Prinster
Nicholas Prokopchuk
Charles F. Purvis
Raymond J. Quan
Alvin J. Quigley
William J. Quigley
James E. Quinn
William E. Raber
Jack N. Rabun
James E. Rachal
Darrel R. Radcliffe
Perry A. Ramey
William E. Ramey
Joe P. Ramirez, Jr.
Roy G. Ramirez
Jerrold A. Ramsay
Frederick A. Randlett
George A. Ravan
Harvey L. Rau
Walter J. Ray
Frank A. Reale
Charles Rechtenbach
Raymond E. Redford
Bobby D. Redic
Chris D. Reed
Jack M. Reed
Ralph W. Reed
Edmond W. Reeder
Ross N. Reeves III
Walter A. Reeves
Gawn W. Reid
Lawrence C. Reifsnider
Robert E. Reigle
William A. Reigle
William A. Reitmeister
Edwin J. Renegar
Luther L. Renfroe, Jr.
Earle L. Renn
Junior G. Reynaud
Charles D. Reynolds
Oren C. Reynolds
Richard W. Rhode
Davey L. Rhodes
Frederick V. Rhyder
Edwin A. Rice
Lewis E. Rice
Luther E. Rice, Jr.
Clarence E. Richards, Jr.
Harold L. Richardson
Herbert C. Richardson, Jr.
William A. Richmond
Clarence J. Ricker
Melvin R. Ricks
Robert L. Ridenour
William N. Riddle
Harold J. Riley
Martin J. Riley, Jr.
Patrick A. Riley
Jerry H. Ringler
Robert J. Riordan
William Risko
Robert R. Rivers
James J. Roberson
Thomas F. Roberson
Frank H. Roberts, Jr.
Lewis C. Roberts
Linton R. Roberts
Thomas E. Roberts
John T. Robertson
Roland G. Robertson
Clifford R. Robinson
Robert B. Robinson
William R. Robinson
Edmund A. Robitaille
Carl L. Rodgers
Lyonel K. Roepke
Cecil W. Rogers
Lionel D. Rogers
Alex F. Roland
Edward P. Rolita, Jr.
Dennis M. Rolland
Donnie L. Romine
Hugh A. Ronalds
Philip G. Roos
James P. Root
William L. Rosbe
Robert L. Rose
Leonard H. Ross, Jr.
Mark C. Roth

Thomas H. Roth
Joseph R. Rotramel, Jr.
Donald G. Roush
Carlton A. Rowe
Clark H. Rowe
Hugh T. Rowe, Jr.
Robert D. Rowe
William W. Ruckel
Thomas R. Rummel
Roger L. Runkle
Edward M. Russell, Jr.
Hayden B. Russell, Jr.
James C. Russell
Robert H. Russell
Robert M. Russell
James A. Ryan
Woodson A. Sadler, Jr.
Hugh F. Sager
Ronald J. Sagnimeni
Billy C. Sanders, Jr.
James W. Sanders
Samuel Sangialosi
George Santiago
John L. Saulnier
Carleton F. Saunders, Jr.
Richard L. Savant
Samuel F. Saxton
Jimmy M. Scarboro
Douglas T. Schanzenbach
Theodore W. Schauer
Paul V. Scheetz, Jr.
Robert E. Schlapfer
Clifford G. Schleusner
Michael E. Schmidt
Charles W. Schmidt
Raymond H. Schmidt
Robert G. Schmitt
William V. Schmitz
Erwin W. Schomisch
Bill M. Schooler
Adrian E. Schoonover
Donald C. Schultz
Frank W. Schultz
Herbert J. Schumacher
Clifford S. Schuring
William O. Schwarz
Eldon Scott
Harmon Scott, Jr.
James L. Scott
Jerome C. Scott
Jesse M. Scott
Ronald L. Scroggin
Frederick H. Seage, Jr.
James W. Seal
George B. Search
Elmer C. Seder
James E. Seitz
John V. Seliga
James A. Sellars
Stephen G. Seman
Benny R. Sepulveda
Louis E. Sergeant, Jr.
Gleason A. Sexton
George A. Shafer
Ronald L. Shafer
Clayton L. Shampoe, Jr.
Michael J. Sharbaugh
Edward S. Sharrow
John G. Shaughnessy
James J. Shea II
William G. Sheldon III
Jerry M. Shelton
Dean S. Shepard
Victor L. Sheppard
William A. Sheridan, Jr.
Bobby L. Sherrow
Warren I. Shick
Clements W. Shiver
Robert L. Shivers
Richard A. Shoaf
Ronald H. Shoop
John J. Shoultys, Jr.
Louis D. Shove
Derek A. Shubin
Peter Shulgay
Kenneth C. Shumate
Anthony E. Sibley
Jerry E. Siler
Joseph R. Simkins
Bruce H. Simmons
Harry A. Simmons
Roger C. Simond
Harvey H. Simpson
Marion R. Skinner, Jr.
Stanley C. Skrobialowski
Charles R. Slavens
James C. Slate
Joe D. Sloan
John J. Slocum
Robert J. Smethurst
Perry Smiley
Alexander G. Smith III
Cameron M. Smith, Jr.
Donald F. Smith
Glen D. Smith
Harold Smith, Jr.
James L. Smith
James C. Smith
James J. Smith
Jessie E. Smith, Jr.
John R. Smith
John R. Smith
Kenneth F. Smith
Lake Smith, Jr.
Marschall I. Smith
Robert E. Smith
Robert E. Smith
William E. Smith
Edward A. Smyth
John J. Snead
Paul L. Snearly
Leland N. Snell
James E. Sommerhauser
Vincent A. Sordello
Harold L. Spainhour
Vincent A. Spalding
James A. Spalsbury
Peter A. Sparkes
Philip P. Speliopoulos
William R. Spellins
Ralph D. Spencer
James A. Spinks III
Robert L. Spooner
Larry J. Springer
Richard E. Squires
Frank S. Sutherland, Jr.
John P. Staffieri
Jackie W. Stanley
James W. Starbuck
Donald I. Stashi
Dorrance E. Statham
Frank A. Staump, Jr.
Jack W. Stephenson, Jr.
William G. Sterling
Raymond D. Stetser, Jr.
Darrell T. Stevens
Herbert W. Stevens
Ralph E. Steward
Richard A. Stewart
Melvin A. Stickler
Cornelius F. Still
Myles C. Still
Gordon P. Stirling, Jr.
Frederick M. Stitcher
Charles D. Stitt
Donald F. Stoffel
James C. Stokes, Jr.
James E. Stoll
Richard C. Stone
Samuel E. Stote
Thomas D. Stouffer
Robert R. Stout
Douglas D. Street
Benjamin J. Strickley
Harry H. Strunk
Willard E. Stull
Charles A. Sudholt
John M. Suhy
John J. Sullivan
Patrick J. Sullivan
Donald W. Sumner
Richard C. Suthard
Cecil E. Swanagin
David O. Swaney
Carl R. Swanstrom
Richard F. Sweeney
Cyrus C. Sweet
Harold W. Swindell
Richard M. Swink
James D. Swinson, Jr.
Walter E. Switzer
Donald Sylvers
Ira L. Sylvester
William P. Symolon
Stephen A. Tace
Charles R. Tackett
Norman F. Taft
George E. Tallmage
James R. Tatum
Gerald L. Tauber
Joseph K. Taussig III
Aubrey M. Taylor
David E. Taylor
Charles D. Tebrich
Bobby A. Templeton
William K. Terrell
Benjamin G. Thomas
Elmer L. Thomas
Frank D. Thomas
Jerrold A. Thomas
Neil S. Thomas
Velpeau C. Thomas
George P. Thompson
Lacy Thompson, Jr.
Leon R. Thompson
Melvin L. Thompson
Thomas L. Thompson
William F. Thompson
Cecil R. Thornton
James C. Thornton
Martin A. Tice
Harold L. Tieking
Robert F. Tillie
Robert W. Timmons
Kenneth W. Tims
Ralph E. Toholsky
William E. Toombs
Robert W. Torrey
Thomas A. Toth
John B. Toy, Jr.
Kevin F. Trainor
Wayne L. Treece
Winfield R. Trott, Jr.
Thomas J. Tucci
Edward P. Trudell
Robert W. Tuleya
Donald R. Turl
Milas E. Turney
Ellsworth J. Turse, Jr.
Curtis A. Twiddy, Jr.
Richard D. Twiford
Leonard D. Tygart
Francis D. Tyson
Paul Underwood
Robert J. Underwood
Andres Vaart
William P. Vacca
Allen L. Vance
Roscoe W. Van Druff, Jr.
Jay H. Van Dyne
Theodore R. Van Kirk
Thomas C. Van Landingham
William L. Van Orden
Isaac R. Vaughan
Joseph A. Vchulek
Robert E. Veigel
Chauncey D. Venuto
Francis E. Verbanic
Peter N. Vidito
Ronald E. Vido
Joseph L. Villeneuve
Richard L. Vincent
Bernard B. Voronin
Gordon R. Wade, Jr.
Charles P. Wager
James P. Wagner
Jack L. Wagstaff
Edward P. Wahl, Jr.
Maurice G. Waitt
John N. Waldron
Robert A. Walden
Houston E. Walker
James E. Walker
Jerry E. Walker
Laurence A. Walker
Loren E. Walker
Mungo R. Walker
Pierre L. Walker
Robert G. Walker
Thomas U. Wall
Bernie J. Wallace
Robert T. Wallace
Donald P. Walsh
Walter R. Walsh, Jr.
Robert Waltman, Jr.
Ronald E. Ward
Virgle C. Warner
Theodore B. Warren, Jr.
Price I. Watkins
Carl D. Watson, Jr.
Henry L. Watson, Jr.
Carl V. Watts
Billie F. Weaver
Billy J. Weaver
James E. Weber
Thomas H. Weber
Robert W. Weeks
Sammy N. Weeks
John Wegl
Charles J. Weigman, Jr.
David E. Welborn
Alexander D. Welch
Claire V. Wells
James W. Wells
Ronald R. Welsh
Lloyd J. Wengeler
Carl J. West III
Jack S. Westbrook
Billy D. White
Carlton P. White
Henry G. White
Robert M. White
Jackie D. Whiteaker
Robert L. Whited
Eddie D. Whitehead
Willis L. Whitehurst
Donald A. Whiteside
Jesse J. Whitten
Marvin A. Whitten
Jack R. Whitworth
Michael C. Wholley
James O. Widel
Frank P. Wilbourne III
Neal D. Wilcox
Charles R. Wileman
Earl K. Wiles
Buford B. Wiley, Jr.
Henry E. Wilhide
Joe H. Willer
George J. Williams, Jr
Irving D. Williams
James D. Williams, Jr
James R. Williams
Roger L. Williams
Samuel G. Williams, Jr.
Donald Willingham
Hugh L. Willner
Russell O. Willson
Richard G. Wilmes
John C. Wilson
John P. Wilson
Kenneth L. Wilson
Robert L. Wilson
William H. Wilson
Fred M. Winkler
James W. Winn
Richard D. Wise
William J. Witt
Howard A. Wold
William C. Wolfe
William M. Wolfe
Kirk S. Wolford
Charles F. Wolverton
Nathan A. Wong
Dana J. Wood
Edmund W. Woodland
William E. Woodman
Gary L. Woods
Duane L. Woodson
Evan K. Woodworth
Neil R. Wooley
Brian T. Wright
Claude C. Wright, Jr.
Eddie B. Wright
James N. Wright
Richard M. Wright
William F. Wright
Michael C. Wunsch
James R. Wyatt, Jr.
Richard J. Yeoman,
James M. York, Jr.
Austin Z. Young, Jr.
John L. Young, Jr.
Robert W. Young
Virgil L. Young, Jr.
John F. Zakian
Phillip B. Zeman
Richard M. Zell
Jon L. Zellers
Delphinus N. Ziegler
Jerry A. Zimmer
John R. Zimmer
Dennis R. Zoerb
Charles E. Zumstein
Donald L. Zumwalt
Robert C. Zwiener

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

George T. Ackerson
James F. Adams
Thomas E. Albright
James A. Amendolia
Leroy V. Anderson
Marie L. Arnold
John C. Astle
Terrance W. Bache
Peter R. Badger
Jerry K. Baird
Russell F. Bailes, Jr.
Vance Baker
Bradley E. Barriteau
Irving A. Bassett, Jr.
Frank M. Batha, Jr.
William P. Bau
Robert E. Baurle
Theodore T. Bean
George Beley
Roger J. Berger
Stephen R. Berkheiser
Stuart C. Berman
Maurice F. J. Bernier
George V. Bershinsky
Lee H. Bettis, Jr.
John A. Bicknas
Norman K. Billipp
Richard A. Bircher
Patrick C. Blackman
Frank S. Blair
Marvin S. Blair, Jr.
Frank R. Blakemore
Lee D. Bodkin
Robert W. Boehm
James R. Bohlig
Jay F. Boswell
Earl T. Bowers, Jr.
John W. Bowman, Jr.
Thomas A. Braaten
Robert J. Bradley
Joseph J. Brennan
Constantinos T. Brown
David L. Brown
David T. Brown
John P. Brown
Robert G. Brown
Terrance D. Brown
William A. Brown
Ronald D. Browne
Randolph D. Brunell
Allan S. Buescher
Phillip G. Burke
Elkanah J. Burns, Jr.
Kenneth R. Burns
John D. Burrill
Walter R. Burroughs
Dwight R. Byers
Markham B. Campaigne
Joseph L. Cannava, Jr.
Nicholas F. Carlucci, Jr.
Patrick G. Carroll
James A. Cathcart
Justice M. Chambers, Jr.
James M. Chapin
Walton F. Chapman
Michael P. Chervenak
James Chickneas
Clayton C. Christensen
Joseph A. Cialone II
Robert P. Cipriani
James P. Clark
Stephen P. Clark
Robert Colonna
Patrick J. Connor
John W. Consolvo, Jr.
Paul M. Cook II
Charles S. Cooley
Kermit C. Corcoran
Alfred G. Cordes
Albert J. Cormier
Billy R. Courtney
William V. Cowan III
Ronald M. Cowin
Chandler C. Crangle
Thomas W. Crew II
Fred R. Crowley
Louis M. Croy, Jr.
Francis J. Cuddy, Jr.
Otis F. Curtis IV
Terry M. Curtis
Ronald L. Czarnecki
Karl E. Dahlberg
William R. Daniel
Samuel D. Davis
William J. Davis
Larry A. Dean
Walter E. Deese
Louis A. de la Garza
Robert J. de Luca
Thomas R. de Lux
James R. de Vore
Paul J. Dietz
Daniel C. Douglas
Robert L. Doup
Paul F. Drnec
Thomas W. Drummond
Richard D. Duff
John W. Dumas
James V. Dunlap
Robert E. Dzialo
Darryl F. Dziedzic
William M. Eaton
Edwin E. Eloe
Clark D. Embrey
John P. Emmett, Jr.
Michael W. Emmett
George J. Eschenfelder III
Richard G. Esler
Donald V. Esmond
Manuel Estela
David P. Evans
Walter R. Fabinsky
Helmuts A. Feifs
David E. Feiring
Ralph E. Fields, Jr.
Andrew R. Finlayson
Charles E. Finney
John L. Fischer, Jr.
Don W. Fishero
William C. Fite
Morris O. Fletcher
George S. Ford
Robert C. Frame
Thomas L. Franklin
Robert L. Frantz
James E. French
John K. French

Barton J. Friebolin
Carlton W. Fulford, Jr.
Philip N. Fultz
Erich E. Gabrys
Joseph C. Gallo
Michael H. Gavlick
Logan T. Gay, Jr.
Howard L. Gerlach
Perry H. Gesell
Henry P. Giedzinski
Robert W. Gillespie II
Clayton S. Gilmore
John P. Glasgow, Jr.
Woodruff C. Goble
George W. Gorman
Joaquin C. Gracida
Perry H. Graves III
Ainslie A. Gray, Jr.
John W. Greenfield
Bruce E. Griesmer
Raleigh R. Griffiths
James D. Grosshans
James W. Groulx
Gary L. Gruhl
Raymond A. Guertin
Jerald J. Haggerty
Andrew M. Haglage
James C. Hajduk
Thomas L. Hall
Bernard Halloran
John L. Hamilton
Eugene R. Hardman
Jeanne L. Harfin
Kenneth L. Harmon
Russell J. Harrison
Ronald J. Hartnett
William M. Hatch
Edward Hatton III
Harold B. Hauptfuhrer
Gale E. Heaivilin
Bruce A. Heitz
Ronald A. Hellbusch
James J. Henderson III
Wallace Q. Henderson
Charles D. Henricks
Peter M. Hesser
Robert Hickerson
John L. Hickman
Robert G. Hill
Robert T. Hill III
Munn E. Hinds, Jr.
Edmond R. Hinkle
James D. Hintz
Miles M. Hodges
Richard W. Hodory
Patricia A. Hofheinz
John Holderness
Stanley M. Holmes, Jr.
John C. Holmgreen, Jr.
Raymond J. Hoogendoorn
Richard F. Hoogerwerf
Walter S. Horsfall
Nathaniel R. Hoskot, Jr.
Darrel R. Hotard, Jr.
Jack D. Howell
John C. Howell
James L. Huff
Charles E. Hughes
Robert D. Huie, Jr.
Richard E. Hulslander
James G. Hulsey, Jr.
Ralph P. Hundley
Donald R. Huskey
William R. Hunt, Jr.
Homer G. Hutchinson III
Larry W. Hutson
John S. Hyde
Frank M. Izenour, Jr.
Dennis D. W. Jackson
Marvin L. Jackson
Randall N. Jacobsen
Christopher P. Jameson
William M. Jarosz
Jack D. Jewell
James E. Johnson
William F. Johnson
Stanley G. L. Johnson, Jr.
Richard P. Jozwiakowsi
Joseph D. Joiner
John M. Kaheny
Lee D. Kane
Lawrence G. Karch
Thomas A. Keene
James M. Kelly
John M. Kelly
Michael S. Kelly
Samuel C. Kelly III
Samuel J. Kelly, Jr.
Robert H. Kennedy
Carl B. Kepford
Ronald R. Kersey
Jack Kettler
Joseph W. Kim III
Claude E. King
Frederick L. Kingery
Richard T. Kohl
Donald E. Koppenhaver
John J. Krauer
Earl A. Kruger
Robert J. Kuhlman, Jr.
Coleman D. Kuhn, Jr.
Kathleen D. Kupferer
Aniela Kwiatanowski
Francis W. Lamotte, Jr.
Bruce A. Lang
Robert K. Lange
Timothy L. Laplaunt
Richard M. Larson
Fred C. Lash
Ronald J. Laughlin
Robert E. Lavender
Edmond H. Lawrence
Michael R. Layman
Shawn W. Leach
Walter V. Lemmond III
Robert C. Lewis
Newton A. Lieurance, Jr.
Bobby R. Light
Ralph B. Lilja
Steven P. Lindsey
Frank E. Littlebury
Herman I. Little, Jr.
Andrew M. Lloyd III
Robert E. Logan, Jr.
Carl E. Long
John T. Lovell
Willis J. Lovitt, Jr.
Paul J. Lowery
Robert E. Lund
Arthur N. Mangham, Jr.
Bruce D. Mansdorf
Samuel R. Marrone
James J. Marshall
David O. Martin
Thomas D. Martin
William R. Masciangelo, Jr.
Robert J. Matthews
Dean H. Matzko
Jeffery W. Maurer
William G. McBride, Jr.
Jimmy W. McClung
Richard S. McConnell, Jr.
James F. McCool III
Denis H. McDonald
Patrick J. McElhinney
Harold S. McGinnis, Jr.
Donna R. McLennan
Edward L. McMenany, Jr.
Warren R. McPherson
Antoinette E. Meenach
Fred J. Meier, Jr.
Eugene G. Meiners
Bradford B. Meyers
Edward L. Michael
Arthur F. Millard
Peter B. Millichap
David L. Mix
John W. Mohr
Russell E. Moke
Kenneth W. Moore
Richard G. Morin
Alfred H. Mossler
Dean L. Mottard
Richard J. Muller
Jerold A. Mulloy
Edward M. Myers
Thomas E. Nadolski
Thompson D. Neff
Robert E. Neithammer
James H. Nelson
Russell L. Nelson
Thomas S. Nelson III
Allen D. Nettleingham
Gary L. Newkirk
Denver L. Newman, Jr.
Richard B. Newton
Michael K. Nickerson
John F. Noel, Jr.
Phillip C. Norton
Henry R. Nothhaft
Peter W. Oatis
Stephen J. O'Neill
John P. Oppenhuizen
James C. Orr
Edward V. Osborne
Thomas F. O'Toole
Leslie M. Palm
Peter L. Perkins, Jr.
Warren B. Partain, Jr.
James A. Pelli, Jr.
James L. Pendland, Jr.
Guy A. Pete, Jr.
William C. Peters
Dennis A. Peterson
Charles L. Phillips
Weller A. Phillips III
Louis T. Pierce, Jr.
Charles W. Pigott
John P. Pindel, Jr.
John M. Pinkerton
Sam Pisacreta
Robert S. Plaisance
Erle L. Plunkett, Jr.
Edward J. Polasek, Jr.
John R. Pope
Frank D. Powell
Paul J. Prinster
David S. Randall, Jr.
David L. Rankin
Geoffrey K. Rasmussen
Charles Rechtenbach
Ross N. Reeves III
Lawrence C. Reifsnider
Andrew D. Reidstetter
David W. Rice
William M. Rice
Clarence E. Richards, Jr.
James S. Richardson
Robert L. Ridenour
Charles N. Riley
Brian A. Rindt
Robert J. Riordan
Robert R. Rivers
Frank H. Roberts, Jr.
Roland G. Robertson
David B. Robison
Richard D. Rodriguez
Robert T. Rohweller
Alex F. Roland
Dennis M. Rolland
Hugh A. Ronalds
William L. Rosbe
Zebedee L. Rush
Billy E. Russell
Woodson A. Sadler, Jr.
Ronald J. Sagnimeni
Douglas T. Schanzenbac
Philip M. Scherer
Barbara A. Schmidt
Raymond H. Schmidt
Robert G. Schmitt
Charles J. Schneider, Jr.
Klaus D. Schreiber
William O. Schwarz
James L. Scott
Janice C. Scott
James W. Seal
James E. Seitz
George A. Shafer
Michael N. Shahan
Michael J. Sharbaugh
Terry K. Shaw
James J. Shea II
Robert A. Shearer
William A. Sheridan, Jr.
Millard M. Shell
Donna J. Sherwood
Robert J. Short, Jr.
Derek A. Shubin
Kenneth C. Shumate
Anthony E. Sibley
Bruce H. Simmons
James O. Singer
Thomas D. Sizemore
Cameron M. Smith
John R. Smith
Larry E. Smith
Marschall I. Smith
Michael Z. Smith
Edward A. Smyth
James A. Spinks III
Robert L. Spooner
Amy E. Spratlin
Larry J. Springer
Richard E. Squires
Norman S. Stahl
Joanne L. Stangenberger
Richard A. Steele
Jack W. Stephenson, Jr.
Richard A. Stewart
Myles C. Still
James C. Stokes, Jr.
James E. Stoll
Terry W. Stone
Thomas D. Stouffer
Robert R. Stout
Charles A. Sudholt
John M. Suhy
John J. Sullivan
Patrick J. Sullivan
Terry P. Swanger
James D. Swinson, Jr.
William P. Symolon
Dale C. Synnes
Stephen A. Tace
Joseph K. Taussig III
David E. Taylor
Charles D. Tebrich
William K. Terrell
John W. Theisen
William E. Thompson
Thomas L. Thompson
Martin A. Tice
Richard J. Tipton
Thomas A. Toth
John B. Toy, Jr.
Edward L. Trainor
Kevin F. Trainor
William E. Treadwell
Robert E. Trigalet
Alan J. Tucci
Clara L. Tucker
William D. Turnbull
Ellsworth J. Turse, Jr.
Curtis A. Twiddy, Jr.
Andres Vaart
William P. Vacca
Jay H. Vandyne
Chauncey D. Venuto
Peter N. Vidito
Eric P. Visser
Michael L. Vizas
Sidney S. Wade, Jr.
Laurence A. Walker
Thomas U. Wall
Walter R. Walsh, Jr.
Martha S. Webb
John Wegl
Allen E. Weh
Alexander D. Welch
Daniel L. Welker
Harriet T. Wendel
Carl J. West III
Buddy P. Westmoreland
John K. Wetter
Carlton P. White
Robert M. White
Eddie D. Whitehead
Michael C. Wholley
Frank P. Wilbourne III
Buford B. Wiley, Jr.
Michael W. Willett
Delvin R. Williams
James D. Williams, Jr.
James R. Williams
Joseph H. Williams
Roger L. Williams
Thomas W. Williamson
Digby H. Willard
Richard G. Wilmes
Lynn W. Wilson
Fred M. Winkler
James W. Winn
William C. E. Wolfe
Nathan A. K. Wong
Dana J. Wood
Larry A. Wood
Evan K. Woodworth
William F. Wright
Michael C. Wunsch
Kenneth A. Wymer
Richard J. Yeoman
Virgil L. Young, Jr.
Nels C. Youngstrom, Jr.
John S. Zdanowski
Richard M. Zell
Jon L. Zellers
Phillip B. Zeman
Jerry A. Zimmer

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Richard L. Akin
Charles R. Allison III
David S. Althaus
James H. Amos, Jr.
Gordon E. Anderson
Joseph T. Anderson
James E. Anthony
Michael J. Arent
Grey C. Axtell
Steven D. Bailey
William C. Bailey II
Wheeler L. Baker
George H. Baldwin, Jr.
John T. Balha
John D. Bank
Richard E. Barber
Clarke C. Barnes
Charles W. Barrett, Jr.
Drew J. Barrett III
Gary W. Basham
Clarence E. Bates, Jr.
Michael J. Baumhover
David C. Beard
Donald A. Beaufait
Larry R. Beeson
Stephen E. Beiser
Roy S. Belcher III
James D. Bell
Jack W. Below
John R. Benesh, Jr.
Ralph L. Bertelson
Kenneth W. Best
Donald R. Bishop
David A. Blakely
William F. Blum
Kenneth F. Boechler
John A. Bohn
Charles F. Bolden, Jr.
Donald R. Bolger
Gilbert H. Bolton
Craig P. Boulton
Tillman S. Boxell
Stephen C. Brandt
William J. Brennan
Christopher W. Brindle
Robert A. Brooks
Homer W. Brookshire, Jr.
Michael D. Brosee
Gary W. Bross
David Brown
Jack P. Brown
Richard A. Brown
Charles P. Brust
Helmut B. Bubbel
Roger D. Bullard
Michael W. Burkhart
Lynn A. Burrill
Michael A. Burrows
Earl D. Byler
Conrad H. Cadman
Robert E. Cahill
Charles F. Caldwell
Charles W. Campbell
Reid O. Carlock
Roy L. Carter
Richard P. Cassidy
Robert E. Castle
Joseph M. Chaisson
Andrew L. Charlson
Patrick F. Chorpenning
Louis E. Cimaglia
James L. Clark
John R. Cole
Robert L. Collins
William T. Collins
Richard A. Combs
Donald L. Conover
George S. Converse
Richard E. Cooper
Walter O. Cottrell
Wayne L. Courtney
Norman B. Crawford
Clarence S. Crowe
Michael J. Cummings
John F. Dalton
Stephen J. Danaher
Jack A. Davis
William R. Davis III
Charles G. Dean, Jr.
Peter M. Degnan
Robert R. DeGolian
Wayne A. Deines
David K. Denson
James A. Detch
Francis A. Dieli
Charles A. Dittmar, Jr.
Ronald B. Dobie
Raymond S. Dolgert
Walter L. Domina
William I. Donaldson, Jr.
Charles R. Donofrio
David T. Dotson, Jr.
James H. Dubose, Jr.
Brendan Duff
Patrick E. Duffy
Dennis E. Dugan
Michael T. Duncan
Donald L. Dziggel
Samuel G. Easterbrook III
Jerry D. Edwards
Gordon L. Eisert
Milton J. Eisiminger
Patrick N. Ellis
John R. Erickson
Olav J. Espenes
Richard S. Everhart
Richard G. Ewers
Thomas W. Fant
Paul C. Farmer
Oscar B. Fears, Jr.
Paul E. Fedeles
John R. Fenton

Kenneth A. Fish
John F. Flammang, Jr.
Marvin H. Floom, Jr.
Will R. Forrest
James D. Fortune
Charles R. Fox
John F. Fraser, Jr.
Laurence W. Frederick
Charles H. Gallina
Gary L. R. Gerard
Richard E. Glantz
Richard P. Glietsmann, Jr.
John X. Golich
Ronald J. Gonzales
Robert B. Goodrich
Gary J. Goslin
Lawrence D. Graeber
William J. Graham
Laurens B. Grandy, Jr.
Kenneth R. Gray
Joseph R. Green
Wallace C. Gregson, Jr.
Allen D. Guins, Jr.
Michael W. Hagee
Clarence E. Hagstrom, Jr.
Lee A. Haltom III
Roger C. Ham
Larry E. Hamblin
Richard D. Hammer
Edward C. Hammerbeck
Stuart D. Hammons
William F. Haizlip, Jr.
Thomas G. Harkins
Thomas F. Harper
George K. Harris
James P. Hartready, Jr.
Timothy M. Hartsook
Robert C. Haskett
Dean H. Hattan
John E. Hayes
Robert G. Hempel
John F. Hendry
Clifford F. Henes II
Robert W. Hensley
John C. Hergert III
James C. Hess
Robert T. Hickinbotham
Edward A. Highers
Elber A. Highers, Jr.
Allyn J. Hinton, Jr.
Michael G. Hire
Charles D. Hoelle, Jr.
Timothy G. Hoff
John J. Holly
John W. Hooper
Dennis K. Howe
Paul A. Howes
John C. Howland
Harvey E. Hufffman
William C. Hunt
Jerry L. Hyde
David H. Ingram
Erin L. Ireland, Jr.
Albert F. Jackson
Wayne T. Janecek
Barry E. Jankiewicz
Herman R. Jennette, Jr.
Fred W. Johnson
Gerald E. Johnson
Delver J. Jones
James D. Jones
Michael A. Kalashian
Wayne S. Keck
Lawrnece G. Kelley
Lawrence H. Kener
Lloyd E. Kenney
John P. Kiley
Charles H. Kinney
Jack W. Klimp
David T. Knapp
Frank L. Kooevar
Walter J. Kowalewski
Ellsworth R. Kramer
Dwight D. Kranz, Jr.
Jon J. Kratz
Michael L. Kudalis
Philip A. Lahlum
John H. Lakin
Rober R. Lalonde
Robert D. Lankes, Jr.
Roy A. Larkin
Ivan G. Larsh
Michael N. La Valle
Richard A. Lawrence
Thomas I. Leach
Stephen B. Leslie
Charles M. Lohman
David M. Lohr
Andrew K. Long, Jr.
Thomas E. Loughlin
Thomas J. Loughran
Connie B. Lovett
Robert K. Lunday, Jr.
Ross M. MacAskill
David B. MacFarlane
John M. Mack
Robert J. Mack
Ronald A. Malmgren
John W. Mann
James A. Marapoti
Richard J. Marien
Jeffrey A. Marlin
Douglas B. May
James C. May
Michael R. McCarty
Charles W. McCoy, Jr.
Scott E. McDaniel
John C. McKay
Michael B. McKeithen
Norman E. McKonly, Jr.
Jon M. McNerney
Anthony R. Medley
Stephen N. Melgaard
Patrick A. Michel
Charles A. Millard
Charles G. Miller
Rodney A. Miller
Charles P. Minor III
Joseph A. Mitchell, Jr
Carl W. Monk, Jr.
Charles E. Moore
James B. Moore, Jr.
Dermott W. Morley
Michael C. Morschauser
Leonard J. Mrozak
Larry A. Mueller
James E. Mulloy, Jr.
William H. Munyon
Curtis W. Murray, Jr
Terrence P. Murray
Martin J. Macrelli
John E. Neithammer
Garry D. Nelson
John S. Newby, Jr.
Domnic Nicolosi, Jr.
Thomas E. Noel
Oliver L. North
Timothy P. Nunan
William L. Nyland
Christopher C. O'Banks
Bryan D. O'Connor
Steven J. Oder
Malcolm L. Ogilvie, Jr.
Spencer F. Olsen
John F. O'Neil
Richmond D. O'Neill
Wilbert E. Orem, Jr.
Jerry D. Owen
Mackubin T. Owens, Jr.
William M. Palmer, Jr.
Thomas A. Pantke
Fred M. Parkowski
Michael L. Patrow
George M. Pease
Charles A. Pelletier
Robert R. Petering
William G. Peters
Thomas H. Petersen
Ross T. Petersen
Robert H. Pfeiffer
Roy F. Phillips
Richard L. Piper
Richard D. Porrello
Paul B. Pratt, Jr.
Theodore M. Printy
Lloyd H. Prosser
Jerry B. Pullium
Norman D. Raderer
Raymond C. Raece
William E. Ransbottom
Arthur J. Rauchle, Jr.
Joseph V. Reasbeck III
John M. Reddeck
Joseph D. Reich
Victor F. Reston
Jesse W. Rigby
Brian B. Riley
David B. Ripley
James D. Ritchie
James H. Roach
Joseph W. Roach
Marlen C. Robb, Jr.
Leonard T. Roberts
Ray A. Roberts
William E. Roberts
Joe D. Robinson
Christian A. Rodatz
Craig S. Roepke
Wayne E. Rollings
Mark A. Roman
Jeffrey T. Ronald
Orville G. Rowe
Jimmie L. Russell
Charles H. Schaefer
Marc A. Scheele
Edwin S. Schick III
William J. Schmitt
William H. Schopfel III
Lowell N. Schwankl
Eric D. Shafer
Rodney E. Shapiro
Colin B. Sillers, Jr.
Gordon L. Silliker, Jr.
Herbert P. Silva
Charles H. Silver, Jr.
Michael K. Simmons
Clyde E. Smith, Jr.
Lawrence W. Smith III
Ralph E. G. Sinke, Jr.
Ronald D. Skow
Daniel M. Smith
George Solhan
Dennis L. Snook
Mark S. Splain
Louis J. Stanislao
Peter R. Stenner
Arnold T. Stevens, Jr.
Michael D. Stewart
James V. Stiger
George F. St. John III
Dennis M. Storm
Richard C. Strack
Robert D. Strouse
John M. Struble
Tom E. Sulick, Jr.
Calvin L. Swanson
Thomas K. Tardy
William M. Taylor
James P. Terry
Allan G. Thaut
Daniel L. Thompson
Larry M. Thrasher
Christopher S. Tibbs
Raymond S. Tiney, Jr.
William F. Titterud
Joseph B. Towle
George L. Townsend
Tompson R. Toyama
Thomas B. Trammell, Jr.
James N. Treadwell
Mark C. Treanor
George E. Tucker
Travis J. Tucker
William T. Tucker
Thomas D. Turner
Daniel V. Urban
Edwin R. Valdez
Dyrck H. Van Dusen
Rondall L. Van Houtan
Earnest A. Van Huss
Theodore R. Vivilacqua
James L. Volkmar
Rudy J. Wadle, Jr.
Kim A. Wahtera
Stephen T. Waimey
Frank N. Waldrop
Patrick G. Waller
Roger P. Waniata
Buddy A. Ward
William D. Warren
Francis P. Warrington
Myron Wasiuta
James L. Watson, Jr.
Walter T. Weathers, Jr.
James H. Webb, Jr.
Terence A. Weigel
Donald R. Weiler
Lawrence W. Wells
Paul F. Wendler
Charles T. Westcott, Jr.
Newell J. Weston
William A. Wheeler
Robert L. Whitaker
John F. Whittle
Douglas P. Wiita
Kirby L. Williams
Rickey D. Williamson
Carl R. Wilson, Jr.
Paul E. Wilson
Guy C. Windheim
James D. Wojtasek
Walter J. Wood
Claud V. Woodard
Thomas G. Woods
Waite W. Worden, Jr.
James A. Yorg
Fred J. Young, Jr.
Donald F. Zeller

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer (W-4), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Terrance A. Conner
Howard Holden
Paul H. Leahy
Andrew M. Olesak
Howard W. Vandoren

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer (W-3), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Louis Acosta
Kenneth E. Allen
Joseph L. Backo
Paul R. Baker
Walter T. Baschnagel
John W. Bishop
Eugene A. Bowen
Wallace D. Bracken
George H. Brandt, Jr.
Harry L. Brooks
Charles O. Brown
Jerry E. Bunting
Paul W. Capelle
Darl G. Capps
Kenneth W. Clem
George W. Champion
Ralston S. Clinch
Edwin J. Coyle
Alvin L. Craig
Rolland M. Dalbey
Robert G. Dietz
Bernard R. Doran
Edward A. G. Downes
Duane R. Doyle
William F. Driscoll
Emmett D. Duncan
Joe H. England
Wendel P. Fager
Robert D. Favreau
George W. Fenwick
Raymond E. Ferguson, Jr.
John B. Fetchko
Billy J. Fifer
George A. Fischer
Clyde W. Folsom
Billy K. Gabriel
Thomas R. Gardner
Antonio F. Garibay
Barry J. Georgia
Ernest L. Gibson, Jr.
Lester R. Grose
Clarence L. Guthrie, Jr.
William J. Gwaltney
Richard J. Hanna
Ronald C. Harrison
Lawrence E. Harry, Jr.
Lyle C. Hassen
Donald L. Hazlett
Joe P. Hedrick
Robert A. Heusner
Wellington A. Hiester, Jr.
James F. Hollis
Byron L. Houggard
Edmond R. Humm
Allyn A. Humphreys
Archer D. Hurd
Daniel J. Hurley
Joseph A. Johann
Dan E. Johnson
James R. Kelly
George F. Kenner
Bernard W. Keroack
Walter R. Ketring, Jr.
Frank A. Lambert
Billy B. Larue
John E. Lawrence, Jr.
Randall W. Lichty
William E. Lisenby
Charles E. Long
Charles J. Loof, Jr.
Robert W. Macfarlane
Paul B. Maguire
Leon Mattox
Robert J. McWhorter
John J. Miles
Robert D. Miller
Glenn P. Milliman
Douglas W. Montana
Roger G. Morgan
Anthony Mucci
Paul A. Myers, Jr.
Ronald D. Newman
Peter W. Nicolai
William Noonan, Jr.
Henry W. Nyenbrink
Howard C. Oakley
Eugene J. Ockuly
James G. Olsen
William H. Omdahl
Charles W. Paschen
Arthur R. Pearce
Benson Peltzer, Jr.
Robert E. Pope
Bebe B. Porter
Sam J. Prato
Dale Raymond
Thomas E. Redican
Daniel W. Richards
Richard L. Ross
Stephen J. Rosta
Richard S. Russell II
January T. Sakert, Jr.
William C. Schlondrop
Paul S. Shank
Charles W. Smith, Jr.
John M. Steele, Jr.
Joe W. Stone, Jr.
James H. Stowell
Guy S. Stroup
Frank R. Sutherland
Charles C. Taylor
Thomas F. Taylor
Allen B. Thrailkill
Edwin D. Tidwell
Howard L. Underwood
Alan W. Waldenville
Richard E. Weatherly
David C. Weber
Louis L. White
James J. Wiese
Floyd B. Worcester
Robert L. Worley

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer (W-2), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Norbert H. Adams
Frank L. Ahsue
Phillip D. Allum
George L. Alvarez
Ronald S. Ambrose
Byron A. Anderson
Darrell R. Atkins
George F. Aylward
Glenn C. Bargerstock
Daniel D. Barth
Donice R. Bartlett
Rodney A. Beal
Benjamin W. Beck
Thomas V. Allen
Robert C. Allison
Ronald H. Alnutt
Robert D. Amos, Jr.
Douglas E. Anderson
Raymond F. Asselin
Rodney F. Ayers
Marion R. Baggs
Boyd B. Bare
Windle W. Barnett
Hector Barrientes
Robert C. Bash
Henry S. Bass
George L. Begor
George J. Bennett
Robert W. Bennett
Robert C. Benson
Kenneth W. Berkey
Calvin J. Berton
Homer E. Bever
John A. Binder
Jerry C. Black
Thomas M. Bland
Philip W. Blaylock
Brent S. Bofenkamp
Lee A. Boise
Richard D. Bondurant
Alfred J. Borowy
Edward B. Boyle
Eddis J. Bradford
Garold N. Brocks
Robert D. Brooks
Arthur J. Brown
Benjamin M. Brown
Donald J. Brown
John H. Brown, Jr.
Arthur Brownfield III
Clarence C. Bryant
Jeat Bullock
Robert H. Canning
Charles E. Cannon
James R. Cannon
Anthony F. Caputo
Edward Cardoza
Gary L. Carnicle
John E. Carter
Roger E. Carver
Grover C. Casen
Ernest H. Cates

Arthur J. Chapman
Marshall C. Chase
Larry D. Choate
Edgar L. Clemons
Wilfred J. Clifford
Charles F. Colleton, Jr.
Howard J. Collins
Joan M. Collins
Hubert C. Cornett
John F. Craiglow
Larry G. Cravens
Charles R. Craynon
Charles F. Cross
Robert J. Dalton
Glenn L. Darst, Jr.
John W. Davis, Jr.
John W. Baure
Travis E. Belcher
Ronald R. Benoit
Thomas G. Benson
Bobby F. Bequette
Cecil B. Berryman
Lois J. Bertram
Robert W. Bland
Otis W. Bledsoe
William Blott
Gary M. Boggess
Jackson D. Boley, Jr.
Leo C. Boutin
John H. Bower
Billy T. Branch
Gary L. Bringham
Austin M. Bromley
John V. Brooks
Robert D. Bunner
Jack H. Burrell
Fred J. Call
Marion G. Cameron
Donald A. Camper
Robert A. Carney
Robert W. Carswell
Charles V. Clark
Curtis R. Clark
Donald J. Clark
Raymond C. Clausen
Larry A. Connin
Anthony J. Cotterell
Stanley E. Cottle
Donald L. Cramer
Duane E. Crawford
Ronald K. Crockford
John T. Crowe
Robert L. Davis
Anthony A. Degennaro
Hubert D. Dejaynes
John W. Dillinger, Jr.
David C. Dirks
Richard H. Dittman
Frank H. Dowden
Sidney E. Durham
George H. Dustman, Jr.
H. L. Dykes
Victor B. Elder II
Vernon R. Elliott
Roy F. Falgout
Jon H. Fasnacht
Ralph L. Fecke
James E. Fields
Paul S. Flaherty
Thomas E. Davis
Romain L. Deffes, Jr.
Don E. Diederich
Leroy Dobson
Billy D. Donnell
Daniel B. Dorn
Thomas L. Doss
Jerome Drucker
Michael J. Duggan, Jr.
Donald R. Dunagan
Bobby E. Dusek
Eugene W. Elfes
Thurlow D. Ellis
Fred C. English
Lewis J. Fallon, Jr.
John T. Fanning
William T. Farrow
Joseph F. Featherston, Jr.
Barry E. Fellinger
William J. Ferral
Wolfgang H. Fleck
Jerry D. Floe
Norman R. Ford
William D. Franks
Leo P. Gagnon
Michael P. Galasky
Craig D. Gallan
Robert L. Garoutte
Robert T. Garrow
Donald T. Gatton
Harold S. Gazaway
Robert L. Gibson
Earl E. Giles
Charles N. Goff
Tom A. Golden
Ronald W. Gould
Alan N. Graham
Wayne K. Gray
Ray H. Green
Bryan O. Griffith
James H. Griffith
Richard L. Grivner
Robert M. Gulley
Robert E. Gwaltney
Fred Gypin, Jr.
Robert E. Hamilton
Walter R. Hampton
Emmett L. Haney
Thomas E. Hann
James F. Hansen
Charles D. Harrell, Jr.
Arturo Flores
Edwin C. Ford, Jr.
John H. Fraser
John P. Freitas
Stanley L. French
Arthur J. Furtney, Jr.
Alfredo S. Garcia
Bernard E. Gardner
Leroy A. Garrett
Haywood P. Gibbs
Michael Gierczynski
Neil W. Goddard
Samuel M. Gordon
Joseph A. Goulet
Oliver F. Gour, Jr.
Jack C. Green
Jessie Grimes
Thomas J. Hager
Robert L. Haines
Ronald E. Hardy
Robert D. Harrison
Joe H. Hatchel
Jerome D. Hayes
Paul C. Haynes
Gordon E. Heishman
Charles R. Hern
Leroy Hicks
Robert C. Hitte III
John W. Horton
Walter D. Huels
Thomas Y. Hundley
Roosevelt Hurt
Rolf R. Iversen
Charles R. Jernigan
Joseph M. Jewett
Bobble J. Johnston
Darrell G. Johnston
John A. Jones
John E. Journey
Martin F. Kahl
Roger L. Keatley
Eugene L. Keiter
Ralph E. Kelly
Edward D. Kemmis
Peter C. Kendall III
Arthur L. Kent, Jr.
Samuel L. Kerr
James Kight
George C. Kinslow
Joe J. Koliha
Don T. Harris
William H. Harris
Leonard J. Harrison
Berne C. Hart
Orville L. Hastie
Harry A. Haught
Robert D. Hawkins
Thomas E. Hayward
Edgar W. Henninger
Frank E. Hensel
Dale R. Hiller
Jack Hofstra
James N. Holk
Carl L. Huddleson
John L. Irons
Arthur R. Jacobsen, Jr.
Clifton S. Jenkins, Jr.
James Jennings
Donald R. Johnson
Luis A. Juarez
Gary S. Kee
Charles R. Kellison
Jessie W. Kelley
Charles L. Kiper
Robert L. Kloch
William L. Kramer
Kay E. Kramp
William L. Kroelinger
Robert P. Lacoursiere
Roger L. Laton
Donald E. Laughner
Roger O. Ledoux
William E. Lee
Joseph A. Leonski
Lawrence J. Lepage
James W. Lewallen
Junior Lilly
Frederick R. Loughren
William N. Lowe
David W. Loy
Millard F. Matthews, Jr.
Peter J. Matthews
Lawrence W. Matras
William L. Mazourek
William T. McAuley II
William D. McCall, Jr.
Frank H. McCarthy
John E. McCarthy, Jr.
Francis McCombs
Richard G. McCord
Henry W. McGee
John P. McGuire
John M. Knack
Joseph G. Knagge
William J. Knipper
Raymond S. Komo
Joseph S. Krajewski
Frederick W. Krell
Don C. Lacey
Robert B. Lambdin
Carl E. Lamey
John C. Lamson
Antonio Lauretta
Lewis W. Layton, Jr.
William E. Legg
Jack L. Leininger
Ralph Lewis
John A. Lidyard
Arron K. Lockyer
Troy A. Lucas
George L. Lunt, Jr.
John T. Lytle
Hazen E. MacDonald
Loren J. Malone
John T. Maloney
Thomas D. Maloy, Jr.
Lewis D. Manbeck
Earl J. Manning
Joseph R. Manning
Carlos Martinez
Horace W. Marvin
Lester E. Mashburn
John W. Matchett
Philip S. Mayo
Alonzo B. McCall
Ramon V. McClellan
Thomas McCourt
John W. McCue III
Francis M. McDonough
Joseph A. McElroy
Andrew B. McFarlane
Albenious P. McLean
Bert L. McSpadden
Alfred L. Messier
Ward B. Meston
Andrew P. Miller
August O. Miller
William R. Miller
Harry R. Moller
Clarence G. Moore
Robert D. Moorhead
Pasquale J. Morocco
Jerald J. Morrison
Joseph R. Morrissette
Daniel H. McQueary
George B. Meegan
James M. Meehleder
Edmund M. Mello
Edward H. Myer, Jr.
Anthony F. Milavic
Ashby R. Miller
Thomas J. Miller
Rex B. Moody
Edward L. Moore II
Fred A. Moore, Jr.
Theodore C. Moore
Robert G. Morilla
Don E. Mosley
Timothy J. Murphy
Glenn N. Myers
Arthur G. Nadeau
Gary L. Nail
Gerald R. Naperalski
Charles F. Needles
John N. Newman
Charles W. O'Cchipinti
William J. O'Hara
John O. Olsen
William J. Parker, Jr.
Bobby J. Parrish
Paul R. Pelczarski
William M. Pelto
Francis A. Pepe
Edmund T. Peregoy
Arthur A. Pierce
Jack N. Rabun
James E. Rachal
Darrel R. Radcliffe
Frederick A. Randlett
Walter J. Ray
Robert L. Redfield
Raymond E. Redford
Bobby D. Redic
Chris D. Reed
Ralph W. Reed
Albert A. Reynolds
Herbert C. Richardson, Jr.
William A. Richmond
Thomas F. Roberson
John T. Robertson
Lyonel K. Roepke
Donnie L. Romine
Hugh T. Rowe, Jr.
Robert D. Rowe
Edward M. Russell, Jr.
Paul H. Morrissey
Bobby J. Morton
Thomas F. Nagelin, Sr.
Daniel A. Nazarchuk
Ronald J. Neyt
Scott G. Nickell
James F. Nienstedt
Gerald E. Norris
Thomas A. Olson
James R. Owen
Joseph A. Parker, Jr.
Donald J. Parton
Hobart D. Patterson, Jr.
Earl J. Pazos
Robert H. Pendarvis
Jack N. Perrin
Joseph Perry
Abel D. Pierson
Donald E. Pihl
Kenneth E. Pitcher
Joe A. Pope
Bobby J. Ramsey
Donald Ratcliffe
Robert E. Ray
James R. Reichler
Thomas T. Renau
Luther E. Rice, Jr.
Robert B. Robinson
Edmund A. Robitaille
Carl L. Rodgers
Walter A. Rogers
George R. Roser
Roger P. Roux
Claude T. Rudd
Thomas R. Rummel
Vincent B. Russell, Jr.
Donald J. Sabattus
Robert E. Schlapfer
Lyle F. Schmehl
Bill M. Schooler
Keith A. Scott
Elmer C. Seder
Gerald C. Seybold
Richard A. Shamrell
Oscar E. Shaw
Jesse E. Shelton
Dean S. Shepard
John L. Sheppard
Hayden B. Russell, Jr.
James C. Russell
Billy C. Sanders, Jr.
James W. Sanders
John L. Saulnier
Clifford G. Schleusner
Charles W. Schmidt
Adrian E. Schoonover
George B. Search
James A. Sellers
Stephen G. Seman
Louis E. Sergeant, Jr.
William G. Sheldon III
Jerry M. Shelton
Sibyl E. Sherwin
Harvey H. Simpson
Charles R. Slavens
Robert J. Smethurst
Dever W. Smith, Jr.
James L. Smith
Joseph Smith
Paul L. Snearly
James A. Spalsbury
Dennis E. Springer
Jackie W. Stanley
William G. Sterling
Raymond D. Stetser, Jr.
Frederick M. Stitcher
James D. Svitak
David O. Swaney
Richard M. Swink
Jerrold A. Thomas
Joseph Thurmond
Ralph E. Toholsky
William G. Tomlinson
William E Toombs
Wayne L. Treece
Winfield R. Trott, Jr.
Robert J. Underwood
Joseph A. Vchulek
Richard L. Vincent
Jack L. Wagstaff
Robert A. Walden
Jerry E. Walker
Mungo R. Walker
Charles L. Wallace
Robert Waltman, Jr.
Theodore B. Warren, Jr.
Patrick J. Webb
Robert W. Weeks
David E. Welborn
Ronald R. Welsh
Leonard R. Shifflette
Thomas R. Shine
Louis D. Shove
Dean G. Shultis
James C. Smith
John J. Snead
Charles W. Snedeker
James E. Sommerhauser
Lawrence L. Spacek
Philip P. Spellopoulos
Billy C. Steed
J. D. Stewart, Jr.
Frederick C. Stilson
Lawrence L. Sutler
Cyrus C. Sweet
Joseph R. Sylvia
Gerald L. Tauber
William H. Tawney
Thomas W. Taylor
Gerald P. Tetu
William E. Thomas, Jr.
Don O. Thompson
Melvin L. Thompson
Edward P. Trudell
Thomas J. Tucci
Richard D. Twiford
Leonard D. Tygart
James J. Unger
Larry J. Urquhart
Richard C. Vancott
Thomas C. Van Landingham
Robert E. Vickers
Gordon R. Wade, Jr.
James P. Wagner
Larry F. Wahlers
Bernie J. Wallace
Lowell A. Wallace
Robert T. Wallace
Henry L. Watson, Jr.
Carl V. Watts
John R. Watts
Richard O. Webb
Thomas H. Weber
Robert J. Weeks
Sammy N. Weeks
James M. Wheatley
Marvin A. Whitten
Earl K. Wiles
Leroy L. Wilson, Jr.
Donald L. Wise
Peter A. Woog
Samuel J. Wood
James M. Woods
James R. Wyatt, Jr.
Theodore A. Youngblood
Donald L. Zumwalt
Lloyd J. Wengeler
Henry G. White
Russell O. Willson
William J. Witt
William M. Wolfe
Charles F. Wolverton
Eddie B. Wright
James N. Wright
Dennis R. Zoerb
Robert C. Zwiener

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer (W-4), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Patrick R. Brewer
Thomas H. Bruce
William D. Clemons, Jr.
Gerald H. Conner
William C. Corbett
Roy H. Crawford
Ernest Crocker, Jr.
Orville H. Duncan
Leo O. Hoffmann
Jo E. Kennedy
Robert McLellan
Glenford A. Newtown
Robert H. Russell
Aaron W. Spikes
A. W. Stuckey
James T. Williams
Robert V. Williamson
John A. Witkoski

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer (W-3), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

David P. Abrams
Robert L. Adams
Bruce M. Albert
Bruce D. Alexander
Raymond L. Anti
Robert E. Atwood, Sr.
David L. Bagley
Willard E. Bailey
Walter E. Barkhouse
Donald N. Barber
William W. Barber
Harold E. Bartell
Donald R. Bean
John C. Beier
Eugene O. Bell
Donald C. Blackwood
James T. Blake
Earl C. Blount, Jr.
Leon J. Bochenski, Jr.
Okey L. Boggs
Glenn E. Bolen
Robert L. Bonifay
William B. Bovee
Robert G. Bradley
Donald R. Brandl
Richard C. Brassington
Ernest V. Bridges
Ferris D. Brown
James E. Brown
Frederick A. Buelow
Ernest A. Burgett
Glydon C. Burkett
James M. Burns
Louis G. Bushnell
Rayon H. Carlisle, Jr.
William D. Carr, Jr.
John H. Carrington
Jackie M. Carter
Lloyd J. Cartmill
Leonard J. Catanzaro
Thomas J. Caulfield, Jr.
Wallace E. Cavett
Howard J. Christenson
William J. Cipperly
Roy L. Clark
Jarrett Colbert, Jr.
William C. Conrardy
Darrell H. Cook
Curtis V. Cooke
Ralph W. Crum
John D. Cummings
Harry F. Curtis
Robert G. Darroch
Frederick E. Daubenspeck
William L. Davidson
Ralph D. Davies
Carroll C. Davis
James S. Davis
Muriel Davis
Paul A. Dean
Marvin D. Deaton
Leslie B. Dehaven
Harold E. Dexter
Robert D. Dodd
Robert J. Doorack
Kenneth M. Douglas
Richard H. Dyberg
Charles D. Eicher
John B. Emeney
Phillip M. Estes
Carroll G. Fain
Robert L. Fain
Stuart W. Fitzgerald
William F. Flom
Henry D. Flood
George R. Flynn
Donald L. Fogg
Ronald L. Foster
Joseph R. Frawley
Harold W. Frazier, Jr.
Alvin E. French
Howard E. Funk, Jr.
Cecil O. Gage
Clarence D. Garcia
Kenneth M. Gardner
Phillip E. Gates
James R. Gauthier
James L. Gentemann, Jr.
Marvin J. George
William E. Gilbert
George E. Gillespie
Carroll S. Gipson
Donald S. Giusto
Alfred J. Golab
Stanley A. Golowski
William H. Gordon
Donald B. Greenlaw
Eugene W. Gregorius
Kevin J. Griffin
Morton L. Hall
Carl D. Hamilton
Troy W. Hancock
Robert C. Hankinson
Tommy A. Harmon
William R. Hayes, Jr.
Harry L. Heebner
Kenneth J. Hendrickson
Douglas R. Herd
William C. Hickey
James E. Hill
Ronald G. Hoffmann
Ralph L. Holiman
Eugene S. Holmberg
Harvey D. Houck, Jr.
Donald C. House
Edward M. Hughes
Douglas W. Hughs
Walter E. Ingram
Earl M. Jennings
Carl O. Johnson
Laverne E. Johnson
Erich J. Johnston
Edward T. Jones, Jr.
William A. Jones
Richard L. Keil
Kenneth K. Keller
James E. Kendall
George P. Kenniston
Ralph R. Kimble
John H. Kinnear
Golden C. Kirkland, Jr.
Stephen F. Kiselicka
Francis Klesyk, Jr.
Harry A. Kling
Richard D. Knox
Herbert S. Kondo
Claudie J. Ladner
James E. Lake
Earle L. Lambert
Roger E. Larvie
David W. Lathrop, Jr.
Charles A. Lawrence
Franklin S. Lea
Earl C. Lee
James M. Leedle
Thomas J. Lesh
Robert M. Ludwig
Karl F. Liebert
Joel F. Lindsey
Roy F. Little
William D. Llewellyn
Edward P. Loftus
Robert B. MacKenzie
Ronald T. Macy
Paul M. Manning
William A. Masker
Robert B. Mason
Ronald J. Mayes
Bernard L. McIlnay
Bruce Mellon
Ralph C. Miller, Jr.
Robert S. Miller
Robert E. Milliron
Mack E. Mitchell
Tom A. Mix
John E. Moody
Johnney W. Moody
Bobby W. Morgan
Alan L. Morrill
Samuel L. Moyer
Dewey E. Mueller
Randolph M. Mulford
Billy D. Nicholas
Fredrick D. Norton
Robert L. Norton
Richard H. Norwood
Roy M. Oehlers
Richard R. Osterberg
Charles L. Pedersen
David T. Penman
Henry A. Peterson
John E. Peterson
Richard E. Phillips
James R. Pippin
William A. Poe, Jr.
William H. Powell
Cleon H. Rafferty
Emma G. Ramsey
Thomas W. Ray
Edmond W. Reeder
Alfred J. Reyer, Jr.
John L. Rhodes
Donald F. Richardson
Martin J. Riley, Jr.
William E. Riley
Harold L. Ritter
Clarence A. Robinson, Jr.
Rodger J. Rodick
Robert L. Rose
Leonard Ross
Richard H. Ross
Edward P. Rotchford
Clark H. Rowe
Stanley F. Sanders
Richard K. Sanders
Edmond S. Sarver
Charles W. Savage
Salvatore J. Scalzo
Anthony P. Schiraldi
Adolph Schmid
William W. Schuon
Norvel M. Scott
William G. Sexton
Richard G. Shore
Daniel L. Siemion
Stanley A. Skalski
Don L. Smith
Frank E. Smith
George M. Smith, Jr.
Lake Smith, Jr.
Ronald R. Smith
Roy E. Simolin
Richard W. Snow
Arlon Solomon
Anthony J. Soltes
Alan J. Sparks
Robert E. Spiker
Peter N. Stavros
William T. Steinken, Jr.
Richard F. Storch
Thomas J. Tandle
Edward G. Tardif
Kenneth E. Taylor
John L. Thacker
Jimmy R. Theriot
Edgar D. Thomas
John G. Tinney
Harry J. Tobin
Francis A. Toth
Richard L. Turcott
Thomas W. Turner
Jimmie Veater
Norman J. Walker
Richard H. Wallace
Robert H. Wallace
Virgil E. Wallace
Calvin R. Waters
Price I. Watkins
Eric P. Watson, Jr.
John C. Watts
John F. Weaver III
William R. Wenglare
John L. Wenrich, Jr.
Charles D. Wheeler
Donald L. Whisnant
Vance E. White
Thomas A. White
Howard C. Wolfe
Clyde V. Wright
James E. Wright
Veo S. Yon
George A. Zettler

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer (W-2), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Raymond K. Allen
Thomas V. Allen
Robert C. Allison
Ronald H. Alnutt
Robert D. Amos, Jr.
Douglas E. Anderson
Raymond F. Asselin
Rodney F. Ayers
Marion R. Baggs
Boyd B. Bare
Windle W. Barnett
Rector Barrientes
Robert C. Bash
Henry S. Bass
John W. Bauer
Travis E. Belcher
Ronald R. Benoit
Thomas G. Benson
Bobby F. Bequette
Cecil B. Berryman
Lois J. Bertram
Robert W. Bland
Otis W. Bledsoe
William Blott
Gary M. Boggess
Jackson D. Boley, Jr.
Leo C. Boutin
John H. Bower
Billy T. Branch
Gary L. Bringham
Austin W. Bromley
John V. Brooks
Robert D. Bunner
Jack H. Burrell
Fred J. Call
Marion G. Cameron
Donald A. Camper
Robert A. Carney
Robert W. Carswell
Charles V. Clark
Curtis R. Clark
Donald J. Clark
Raymond C. Clausen
Alva H. Cobb, Jr.
Larry A. Connin
Anthony J. Cotterell
Stanley E. Cottle
Donald L. Cramer
Duane E. Crawford
Ronald K. Crockford
John T. Crowe
Walter C. Daskam
Robert L. Davis
Anthony A. Degennard
Hubert D. Dejaynes
John W. Dillinger, Jr.
David C. Dirks
Richard H. Dittman
Frank H. Dowden
Sidney E. Durham
George H. Dustman, Jr.
H. L. Dykes
Victor B. Elder II
Vernon R. Elliott
Roy F. Falgout
Jon H. Fasnacht
Ralph L. Fecke
James E. Fields
Paul S. Flaherty
Arturo Flores
Edwin C. Ford, Jr.
John H. Fraser
John P. Freitas
Stanley L. French
Arthur J. Furtney, Jr.
Alfredo S. Garcia
Bernard E. Gardner
Leroy A. Garrett
Haywood P. Gibbs
Michael Gierczynski
Neil W. Goddard
Samuel M. Gordon
Joseph A. Goulet
Oliver F. Gour, Jr.
Jack C. Green
Jessie Grimes
Thomas J. Hager
Robert L. Haines
Ronald E. Hardy
Robert D. Harrison
Joe H. Hatchel
Jerome D. Hayes
Paul C. Haynes
Gordon E. Heishman
Charles R. Hern
Leroy Hicks
Robert C. Hitte III
John W. Horton
Walter D. Huels
Thomas Y. Hundley
Roosevelt Hurt
Rolf R. Iversen
Charles R. Jernigan
Joseph M. Jewett
Bobbie J. Johnston
Darrell G. Johnston
John A. Jones
John E. Journey
Martin F. Kahl
Roger L. Keatley
Eugene L. Keiter
Ralph E. Kelly
Edward D. Kemmis
Peter C. Kendall III
Arthur L. Kent, Jr.
Samuel L. Kerr
James Kight
George C. Kinslow
Joe J. Kolliha
Richard J. Klonoski
John M. Knack
Joseph G. Knagge
William J. Knipper
Raymond S. Komo
Joseph S. Krajewski
Frederick W. Krell
Don C. Lacey
Robert B. Lambdin
Carl E. Lamey
John C. Lamson
Antonio Lauretta
Lewis W. Layton, Jr.
William E. Legg
Jack L. Leininger
Omer F. Leroy
Ralph Lewis
Robert F. Lewis
John A. Lidyard
Arron K. Lockyer
Troy A. Lucas
George L. Lunt, Jr.
John T. Lytle
Hazen E. Macdonald
Loren J. Malone
John T. Maloney
Thomas D. Maloy, Jr.
Lewis D. Manbeck
Earl J. Manning
Joseph R. Manning
Carlos Martinez
Horace W. Marvin
Lester E. Mashburn
John W. Matchett
Philip S. Mayo
Alonzo B. McCall
Ramon V. McClellan
Thomas McCourt
John W. McCue III
Francis M. McDonough
Joseph A. McElroy
Andrew B. McFarlane
Albenious P. McLean
Bert L. McSpadden
Alfred L. Messier
Ward B. Meston
Andrew P. Miller
August O. Miller
William R. Miller
Harry R. Moller
Clarence G. Moore
Robert D. Moorhead
Pasquale J. Morocco
Jerald J. Morrison
Joseph R. Morrissette
Paul H. Morrissey
Bobby J. Morton
Thoomas F. Nagelin, Sr.
Daniel A. Nazarchuk
Ronald J. Neyt
Scott G. Nickell
James F. Nienstedt
Gerald E. Norris
Thomas A. Olson
James R. Owen
Joseph A. Parker, Jr.
Donald J. Parton
Hobart J. Patterson, Jr.
Earl J. Pazos
Robert H. Pendarvis
Jack N. Perrin
Joseph Perry
Abel D. Pierson
Donald E. Pihl
Kenneth E. Pitcher
Joe A. Pope
Bobby J. Ramsey
Donald Ratcliffe
Robert E. Ray
James R. Reichler
Thomas T. Renau
Luther E. Rice, Jr.
Robert B. Robinson
Edmund A. Robitaille
Carl L. Rodgers
Walter A. Rogers
George R. Roser
Roger P. Roux
Robert Rubachko
Claude T. Rudd
Thomas R. Rummel
Vincent B. Russell, Jr.
Donald J. Sabattus
Robert E. Schlapfer
Lyle F. Schmehl
Bill M. Schooler
Keith A. Scott
Ralph R. Scott
Elmer C. Seder
Gerald C. Seybold
Richard A. Shamrell
Oscar E. Shaw
Jesse E. Shelton
Dean S. Shepard
John L. Sheppard
Leonard R. Schiffiette
Thomas R. Shine
Louis D. Shove
Dean G. Shultis
James C. Smith
Kenneth F. Smith
John J. Snead
Charles W. Snedeker
James E. Sommerhauser
Lawrence L. Spacek
Philip P. Spellopoulos
Billy C. Steed
J. D. Stewart, Jr.
Frederick C. Stilson
Lawrence L. Sutler
Cyrus C. Sweet
Joseph R. Sylvia
Gerald L. Tauber
William H. Tawney
Thomas W. Taylor
Gerard P. Tetu
William E. Thomas, Jr.
Don O. Thompson
Melvin L. Thompson
Edward P. Trudell
Thomas J. Tucci
Richard D. Twiford
Leonard D. Tygart
James J. Unger
Larry J. Urquhart
Richard C. Vancott
Thomas C. Van Landingham
Robert E. Vickers

Gordon R. Wade, Jr.
James P. Wagner
Larry F. Wahlers
Lowell A. Walker
Bernie J. Wallace
Robert T. Wallace
Henry L. Watson, Jr.
Carl V. Watts
John R. Watts
Richard D. Webb
Thomas H. Weber
Robert J. Weeks
Sammy N. Weeks
James M. Wheatley
Marvin A. Whitten
Earl K. Wiles
Leroy L. Wilson, Jr.
Donald L. Wise
Peter A. Woog
Samuel J. Wood
James M. Woods
James R. Wyatt, Jr.
Theodore A. Youngblood
Donald L. Zumwalt
Walter H. Agee
Bobby G. Akers
Junior M. Albritton
Valentine P. Amico
Wenceslao U. Aquino
Robert L. Atkinson
James D. Bacon
John C. Bardon
Odis L. Barrett
Bernard R. Barton
Angelo Battista
George B. Bebout
Edward H. Bell
James L. Bell
Raymond L. Bernard
Edward J. Biedrzycki
Robert C. Bierman
Bertha P. Billeb
William J. Billeb
Carl L. Blum
Robert E. Blum
Charles C. Boger
Bridgie E. Bolen
Laurence B. Botts
Kempereth D. Box
Robert N. Boyd
Egbert M. Brady
Herbert R. Bratcher
John E. Brennan
Francis E. Bridges
Charles H. Brittain
Harley A. Butler
William F. Campbell, Jr.
Ferdinando J. Capria
Bert P. Chadd
Frederick W. Chadwick
Normand J. Charest
Joseph G. Chisholm
Robert S. Collins
Charles M. Christensen
Robert S. Collins
Robert M. Conley
Claude R. Cordell, Jr.
Leon R. Coxe
Aaron H. Daniels
Edwin S. Davis
Robert K. Davis
James O. Dease
Donald A. Debarge
Thomas J. Dempsey
Jack S. Deremer
Beauvin J. Deshotel
James P. Diantonis
June R. Duberstein
Raymond R. Ebner
Wesley E. Eckley
George W. Elliott
Stephen D. Ellsworth, Jr.
William T. Estes
Frank H. Falkson
Albert A. Feeley
Donald W. Felty
Andrew C. Ferris
William J. Fitzgibbon
Raymond O. Florence
Daniel E. Folles
Ray Fritz
Leonard E. Gaede
Thomas P. Gent
Jack E. George
Horton A. Glidewell
Raymond F. Golon
Norbert B. Grabowski
William F. Green
Robert A. Green
Leroy R. Greth
William F. Gross
James F. Guenther
Adan Guerra
George R. Hammond
Curt A. Hanke
Joseph B. Harbin
Ivan K. Heinlein
Robert L. Herrington
Francis Hingston
John R. Hoagland
Samuel V. Hooten
Robert M. Hooven
Maurice V. Howard
Lee J. Huffman
William M. Humphreys
Wilburn Ivy
Julius M. Jackson
Joseph P. Jerabek
Herman H. John
Dan C. Johnson
George G. Johnson, Jr.
John L. Johnson
John H. Kelley
Mark M. Kenney
Elmer R. Kimbro
Rex R. Kirkbride
Edward A. Koss
Martin Kusturin
Neil B. Labelle
Donald E. Lambert
William C. Lantz
Albert L. Larson
Gene D. Larson
Robert J. Larson
Richard B. Latondre
Luke E. Littlepage
Warren G. Litzburg
Jackson T. Love
Joseph W. Luckenbach
Arthur T. Manuel, Jr.
Ernest L. Marble
John B. Marks
Charles A. L. Marlow
Travis E. Martin
John H. Martinez
Gary R. Mayfield
William S. McClenithan
Leason McCoy
Francis J. McDonald
George N. McIntyre
Joseph A. McIntyre
Patrick J. McTiernan
Samuel S. Michaels, Jr.
Richard W. Miller
Everett E. Millett
Luke B. Mills,
Stanley S. Minatogawa
John M. Mitchell
Donald E. Monnot
Lawrence Morgan
William P. Moriarity
Gerald D. Morris
Robert J. Mulligan
Charles L. Mungle
Charles R. Munson
Roy L. Myers, Jr.
Richard J. O'Brien
Robert F. Okamoto
Michael O. O'Loughlin
Robert H. Page
Virginia R. Painter
John P. Pangrace
Peter P. Panos
William J. Parker, Jr.
Gordon V. Parnell
Mary E. Pease
Charles D. Peck
Clement S. Perreault
Thomas B. Perrone
Len E. Pierce
Michael Pietroforte
Lynn M. Porter
William H. Powers, Jr.
Virgil Rankin
Robert C. Reedy
John E. Robertson
Robert A. Roche
Charles B. Russell
Glen F. Salter
Clifford C. Scheck
Robert T. Seek
John V. Sisson
Theodore F. Skill
Ernest U. Smith
Frank R. Smith
Jesse W. Smith
Lucius T. Smith, Jr.
Frank M. Spady
Amos N. Sparks
Jack G. Spence
John L. Stark
William A. Stokes
Kenneth C. Sullivan
Robert P. Sullivan
Joseph M. Sweeney, Jr.
James D. Taylor, Jr.
J. T. Tenpenny
Ralph H. Thiemt
Frank L. Thompson, Jr.
William F. Trenary
Guilford D. Tunnell
Conrad B. Turney
Christopher Van Diver, Jr.
Erwin G. Van Sickle
Harry R. Waite
Walter E. Waldie
Charles A. Waller
Henry R. Walsh
Granderson F. Walton, Jr.
John R. Waterbury
Fred L. Weaver
Robert R. Wenkheimer
Charles E. Whitaker
George E. Windsor, Jr.
Robert F. Wolf
Charles W. Woods
Leslie Yancy
Charles M. Yarrington
Wallace E. York
James A. Zahm

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 29 (legislative day of January 10), 1969:

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Paul W. McCracken, of Michigan, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Hendrik S. Houthakker, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Herbert Stein, of Maryland, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Robert F. Froehlke, of Wisconsin, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Barry James Shillito, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Robert C. Seamans, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of the Air Force.

John H. Chafee, of Rhode Island, to be Secretary of the Navy.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

George A. Lincoln, of Michigan, to be Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

James E. Johnson, of California, to be a Civil Service Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring March 1, 1971.

MILITARY STAFF COMMITTEE, UNITED NATIONS

Lt. Gen. John W. Carpenter III, FR1647 (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be senior Air Force member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, under the provisions of section 711, title 10, of the United States Code.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Charles T. Booth II, U.S. Navy, and Rear Adm. Paul P. Blackburn, Jr., U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DRAFT LAWS

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, many Members are receiving correspondence from deans of graduate schools and from graduate students throughout our land concerning students being drafted into the military service during the term or during a time when they are engaged in particularly important research.

It seems to me that our present draft laws must be rewritten. I believe that a lottery system should be adopted and that each of our young men should be eligible for the draft during a 1-year period only, after which time he would be permitted to proceed with his educational training or to go into a profession or a trade, except in case of a national emergency. It is a known fact that only one out of every four eligible men is drafted.

The obligation of every young man to serve his country in time of need is recognized by all loyal American citizens. However, undue interruption of educational careers could result in fewer trained scientists, engineers, and other professional people so necessary to the future development of our country.

Today I received an exceptionally well-written letter from an eminent Kentucky educator which explains the problems of many of our graduate students. I commend it to the Members for their perusal:

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE,
Louisville, Ky., January 21, 1969.

Congressman TIM LEE CARTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CARTER: Only a matter of the gravest concern prompts me to write you at a time when I realize how extremely busy you must be with all the problems which the Congress faces. However, the present Selective Service situation and its impact on the production of advanced scholars in all fields poses a real threat to the survival of our nation in a highly technical age. I realize that a letter from a graduate dean on this matter can be readily interpreted either as expressing a highly parochial interest or the thinking of a fuzzy-minded-intellectual, but serious reflection on the matter will indicate that we have here a problem of the utmost importance. None of us in university circles have requested an out and out deferment of graduate students; what we have asked for is some arrangement whereby people could satisfy their military obligations at times when their academic careers would not be destroyed. The present arrangement is doing just that. Hardly a day goes by but that two or three of our graduate students are ordered to report for induction. Regardless of whether a student's research project is within a few months of completion or whether an additional few months would allow him to finish all his work, he can only be postponed until the end of the current term and then he is off to the service. In the highly specialized studies and research involved in graduate education, there is grave doubt that such an interrupted career can be picked up again after an absence of two years.

Three years ago I lectured at Moscow State